

lution with reference to giving the Ryukyus back to Japan and granting the expanded right of self-government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

973. Also, petition of the chairman, Ginowan City Assembly, Ginowan, Okinawa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to consideration of the request for early permission to select the Chief Executive by popular vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 20, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless His holy name." To Thee we turn, Father of us all, whose patient love is more inspiring to us than Thy power which has created and is creating all things. How gratefully indeed we turn to Thee. To whom else shall we go? Thou hast the words, and the way of life eternal. Standing upon the threshold of every endeavor, every new experience, we must pray, "Thy will be done in us, and in the affairs of all the earth." So we stand upon the threshold of this session of our Nation's Senate, with prayer on our lips and in our hearts. Continue to give guidance to the men and women who have been chosen by us to reason here, to debate here, to represent us here. Inspire, as Thou often hast in the past, their earnestness, their sincerity, their dedication. Bless Thou them, their families, their associations. They know as well as we—indeed, our Father, they know far better—how grave are the times, how serious at home and abroad the devastating issues. Grant health and strength to them, or, at least, patient endurance for their tasks. And may they, O Father, find sufficient time for the refreshing of their spirits, and relief from the pressures. Grant them to be unwearied in well-doing, so that our children and our children's children and all mankind may rejoice, at last, when the Nation and the world will be secure, united in brotherhood and righteousness. In the name of Him who taught us to pray, "For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1964, and Friday, July 10, 1964, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 9, 1964, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On July 9, 1964:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 2369. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain

State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth (Rept. No. 1181).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 9021. An act to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City (Rept. No. 1186).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass. (Rept. No. 1182).

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city (Rept. No. 1183).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194 (Rept. No. 1184).

By Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif. (Rept. No. 1185); and

H.R. 10736. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va. (Rept. No. 1187).

On July 10, 1964:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; with minority views (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 1188).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendment:

H.R. 8954. An act to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1189).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 10322. An act to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86-155, as amended (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service (Rept. No. 1190).

On July 15, 1964:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 3001. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services (Rept. No. 1191).

On July 16, 1964:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1192).

On July 17, 1964:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 6299. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat Field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations

of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1193).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 9, 1964:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

On July 17, 1964:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to authority granted by the House on July 2, 1964, and the provisions contained in section 2, Public Law 88-354, the Speaker had, on July 7, 1964, appointed Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. PURCELL, of Texas; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and Mrs. MAY, of Washington as members of the National Commission of Food Marketing, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 287. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement;

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 6237. An act to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden Grounds, and for other purposes.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during

the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate for the week beginning July 20, 1964.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as advisory members to the U.S. delegation of the ninth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States, to be convened in Washington on July 21, 1964.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF TITLE I AGREEMENT UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting pursuant to law, on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of June 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEES OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that Bank during the month of June 1964, of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN HAZARDOUS DUTIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE PART OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of June 30, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,161 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 510(a)(1) OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF SCHEDULES TO SUSPEND THE DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FISCAL OPERATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the fiscal operations of the United Nations, as of December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF JEWISH RESTITUTION SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, dated June 26, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON UNDERCOLLECTIONS OF INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES ON CERTAIN LOANS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on undercollections of interest and principal in foreign currencies on certain loans to foreign governments, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON LACK OF APPROPRIATE CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN COST SAVINGS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on lack of appropriate consideration of cost savings obtainable by canceling the procurement of ineffective rocket packs for F8U aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN MAILING INFORMATIONAL MATERIAL TO THE PUBLIC BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in mailing informational material to the public by the Washington, D.C., Headquarters Office, Department of Agriculture, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OF HEAVY TRUCKS AND BUSES AT SELECTED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive quantities of heavy trucks and buses at selected military installations, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY ANNUAL EXPENDITURES BY THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE NAVY FOR LEASING CERTAIN COMMERCIAL FACILITIES TO STORE PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on unnecessary annual expenditures by the Departments of the Army and the Navy for leasing commercial facilities to store petroleum products in the Los Angeles, Calif., area, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL ACQUISITION AND USE OF TELETYPEWRITER CIRCUITS AND EQUIPMENT BY THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical acquisition and use of teletypewriter circuits and equipment by the Army and the Air Force, Department of Defense, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PAYMENTS TO COAST GUARD RESERVE OFFICERS ON ANNUAL ACTIVE DUTY TRAINING FOR UNNECESSARY DAYS OF TRAVEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payments to Coast Guard Reserve Officers on annual active duty training for unnecessary days of travel, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERPROCUREMENT OF CONTAINERS FOR 5-INCH, 54-CALIBER AMMUNITION CARTRIDGES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overprocurement of containers for 5-inch, 54-caliber ammunition cartridges, Department of the Navy, dated July 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF QUINAIELT TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CASE OF SIMPSON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of that court's order in the case of *Simpson Construction Company v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CASE OF R. M. CLARK v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of that court's opinion and findings in the case of *R.M. Clark, an individual, doing business as Lenoir City-Alcoa Bus Lines, v. The United States* (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CASE OF MACARTHUR MINING COMPANY, INC. v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of that court's opinion and findings in the case of *MacArthur Mining Company, Inc., in receivership, v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, for the year ended May 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAW, TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1004

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States with reference to enacting legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Colorado to the State of Colorado

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the economy of the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the Federal Government holds 36.3 percent of the land surface area of the State of Colorado and controls 48.5 percent or 32 million acres of the total mineral acreage in the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the development of minerals and the recreational uses of Federal lands impose increased economic burdens on services and facilities of county and State government; and

"Whereas the impending development of an oil shale industry will create additional financial burdens for schools and roads in western Colorado counties; and

"Whereas only 37½ percent of all royalties that the Federal Government collects on Federal lands in Colorado is returned to the State; and

"Whereas Alaska in its Act of Admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the Tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, Tideland States, and the Eastern States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in second extraordinary session convened (the Senate concurring herein), That the President and Congress of the United States of America are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Colorado who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Colorado be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Colorado to be used as the Legislature of the State of Colorado may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of the In-

terior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"DONALD H. HENDERSON,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,

"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1001

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the apportionment of State legislatures

"Whereas historically and traditionally, the people of the sovereign States have provided for the establishment of legislative bodies, the members of which have been elected under provisions of the individual State constitutions to best meet the needs and desires of each particular State, with due regard for population only in one house, and for population, geographic areas, and economic factors in the other house; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Colorado have by a 'one-man one-vote' election, determined for themselves that means of representative government by which they do give consent to be governed, and under that system the people themselves do have the right to initiate changes from time to time as such changes may become necessary; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of Colorado reserves to the people of the State the right of both initiative and referendum; and

"Whereas the people have interests unifying themselves and differentiating among the various regions of the State, and those interests cannot always be served by application of mere arithmetic in the apportioning of both the senate and the house of representatives; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Colorado, in 1962, voted overwhelmingly in each and every county in support of a State constitutional amendment providing that the State house of representatives be apportioned on a basis of population only, and the State senate be apportioned on a basis giving consideration to population, geographic area, and economic factors; and on the same ballot the people of every county rejected overwhelmingly an amendment which would have apportioned both houses of the legislature on a basis of population only; and

"Whereas the function of a bicameral legislature, in many States, is that of providing a balance of representation when clusters of population are the result of topography, or wherein geographic considerations require the equation of area along with population in one of the two houses to effect a reasonable and proper representation of such districts, wherein other factors are present to such a degree as to be of primary concern to the State; and

"Whereas this bicameral function has been clearly recognized and its need fulfilled by an initiated amendment to the constitution of the State of Colorado in 1962; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, has had the effect of nullifying said function of Colorado's bicameral legislature, and overturning the vote of the people which endorsed this function, and substituting therefor a plan which was essentially that rejected by the people of Colorado: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State

of Colorado, in second extraordinary session convened, That the house of representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will require each State of the United States to apportion one house of its legislature on the basis of population and permit each State to apportion the second house of a bicameral legislature on a basis which includes other factors in addition to population, such as geography, economic interests, and historical association; and be it further
"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"DONALD H. HENDERSON,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the request for research funds to eradicate cereal leaf beetles; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petitions signed by Seitoku Nagamine, chairman, Tomigusuku Village Assembly, Seitoku Tomigawa, speaker, Gushikawa-son Assembly, and the Village Assembly of Kawasoe-son, all of the island of Okinawa, praying for permission to select their chief executive by popular vote; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an amendment to the Constitution relating to apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Kentucky Peace Officers' Association, of Lexington, Ky., signed by Lt. Charles L. Young, secretary, relating to the Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Richard H. Davis, of Louisville, Ky., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of Kiamichi Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Wilburton, Okla., relating to the apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Sotir A. Gjorgoski, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Knights of Columbus, Bismarck, N. Dak., relating to prayer in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Arthur Johnson, farm representative, First State Bank of Springdale, Ark., praying for the enactment of House bill 1839, relating to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Farmers State Bank, of Aurora, Nebr., signed by W. Ed Coblentz, president, favoring the enactment of House bill 1839, in regard to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Livestock Feeders Association, of Omaha, Nebr., signed by Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary-treasurer, relating to pending meat import legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring action by the Congress in respect to the

importation of beef and other meat products; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the First National Bank, Tucumcari, N. Mex., signed by G. Wilbur Jones, president, favoring the enactment of House bill 1839, relating to meat imports; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the department of industrial relations, Fair Employment Practice Commission, San Francisco, Calif., expressing appreciation for the enactment of the civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted at the biennial convention of the Lutheran Church in America, at Pittsburgh, Pa., expressing appreciation for the enactment of the civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

ROCHESTER-RENNES CULTURAL CENTER—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for several years the cities of Rochester, N.Y., and Rennes, France, have maintained close contacts with the assistance of the U.S. Information Agency. This friendship of cities culminated in the first Bi-National Cultural Center which was established in Rennes and staffed and equipped by USIA.

This experiment is a noteworthy example of how much goodwill can be created for a small amount of money. It would be most unfortunate if the U.S. Information Agency decided to discontinue the funds which support this Center which has meant so much to the citizens of Rochester and Rennes. It is especially unfortunate at a time when France and the United States are regrettably growing apart in their international policies.

On June 23 the Council of the City of Rochester unanimously adopted a resolution protesting this proposed action of the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the Rochester City Council printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 64-60

Whereas the city of Rochester has maintained close ties with the city of Rennes, France; and

Whereas the program of international cooperation and amity between the cities has flourished under the auspices and guidance of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency; and

Whereas one of the significant aspects of this cooperation has been the establishment in Rennes of the first Binational Cultural Center in France, staffed and equipped by the U.S. Information Agency; and

Whereas the Binational Cultural Center has helped establish the most cordial relations between the United States and France and, more particularly, between the cities of Rochester and Rennes; and

Whereas it has been reported that funds for staffing the Binational Cultural Center in Rennes will not be made available by the American Foreign Service, to the detriment of international understanding and the expansion of amicable relations between the United States and France and between the cities of Rennes and Rochester: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council urge the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency to provide the necessary funds for the continuation of this important program; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and hereby is directed to send copies of this resolution to U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, together with letters urging that the Binational Cultural Center in Rennes be continued.

Adopted by the following vote:

Ayes—Mayor Lamb, Councilmen Barry, Legg, Gillette, Lill, Malley, Malloy, Pierello—8.

Nays—None.

Attest:

W. PATLOW,
City Clerk.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3001. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; placed on the calendar.

(The above bill was reported by Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, on July 15, 1964.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3002. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilhan Baki Taskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Ruiz Coranado (also known as Francisco Ojeda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Riddle Quarries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3005. A bill for the relief of Philip R. Codd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3006. A bill for the relief of Ottilia Brueggemann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3007. A bill to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications;

S. 3008. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

S. 3009. A bill to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROCEDURE FOR PUBLICATION OF PATENT APPLICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the publication of certain patent applications. A major purpose of this bill is to relieve the Patent Office of some of the burden involved in the examination of patent applications. The enactment of this legislation would result in more efficient use of Government personnel and contribute

to a modest reduction in the sizeable backlog of pending patent applications. This bill would also facilitate the more rapid dissemination of scientific information and provide a less-expensive and quicker alternative form of protection for those who currently secure patents mainly for defense purposes.

The bill which I am introducing today was drafted by a committee of the American Patent Law Association and represents the result of intensive study of this subject. In view of the serious burdens which confront the Patent Office it is essential that the Congress, in cooperation with the executive branch, the patent bar, inventors, and industry, seriously consider measures to improve the functioning of our patent system. While I believe that there is merit in the approach reflected in this bill, I am not committed to any particular procedure concerning the publication of patent applications. I introduce this bill to provide a basis for further discussion and I, accordingly, invite interested individuals and groups to communicate their views to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3007) to establish a procedure for the publication of patent applications, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAW, TITLE 17 OF UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and at the request of the Librarian of Congress, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code.

Starting in 1955, the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress, pursuant to appropriations by Congress, has been continuously engaged in preparatory work leading to a general revision of the copyright law. Thirty-four studies and a subject index, prepared by the Copyright Office, have been published by this subcommittee. On the basis of these studies, the Register of Copyrights in July 1961 submitted to the Congress a report containing his tentative recommendations for general revision of existing law. These recommendations have been exhaustively studied by a Panel of Consultants, established by the Register, and composed of representatives of those groups most directly affected by this legislation.

Although I presently have no opinion concerning particular provisions of the bill which I am introducing today, it does represent an effort by the Copyright Office to achieve a general consensus among the conflicting interests involved in this complex subject. The Copyright Office and all others who have assisted in this undertaking should be congratulated.

lated upon the diligence and ability with which they have performed this task.

Significant differences do exist as to certain aspects of copyright revision, but there is general recognition of the necessity for action by the Congress. The present copyright law is essentially that enacted in 1909 and is clearly inadequate to meet contemporary conditions.

I would remind the Senate that the 2d session of the 87th Congress established a target date of December 31, 1965, for the enactment of a revision bill. On that date the provisions of Public Law 87-668, providing for a temporary extension of the renewal term of copyrights pending action on the general revision bill, will expire. Although it will not be possible for the subcommittee to consider this bill during the current Congress, I am introducing it now so that it may be carefully studied and to permit all interested parties to set forth their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3008) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPULSION OF TESTIMONY IN RACKETEERING CASES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases. I should like at this time to quote from the letter which I received from the Attorney General with a draft of this bill was forwarded to me:

It is evident to all of us that combating the forces of organized crime is an undertaking of major proportions. It is also readily apparent that one of the few ways to get incriminating evidence against the principal figures in organized crime is to compel minor participants, who have valuable information, to testify in return for an immunity grant. It is imperative that the Department of Justice should be given this effective weapon in its fight against organized crime. The authority to make immunity grants has been given to nearly all administrative agencies and it seems incongruous to withhold it, in large part, from the prosecutive arm of the Federal Government, where it is most needed.

As was mentioned earlier in my testimony before the committee the problem of obtaining testimony is nowhere more acute than in establishing violations of the Racketeering Travel Act (18 U.S.C. 1952, interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises) which the Congress enacted in August 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3009) to provide for the compulsion of testimony in racketeering cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1113)

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

TEMPORARY CONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN EXISTING RULES RELATING TO THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1114)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I submit an amendment to the bill, H.R. 10467, to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance and that it be printed.

The substantive provisions of this amendment are identical to those of the bill, S. 2846, which the two Senators from New Hampshire introduced on May 14 of this year. That bill would have amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the original congressional intent and specify that sweepstakes conducted by a State would be exempted from the tax on wagering.

My amendment is in the nature of a technical amendment which would put State governments on at least the same basis as charitable and educational corporations, fraternal and benevolent societies, business associations, and chambers of commerce, so far as the Federal tax on wagering is concerned. The present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code clearly specify that no tax will be imposed on a parimutuel wagering enterprise licensed by a State. But the code does not contain any specific exemption for a sweepstakes enterprise which is conducted by the State itself.

The state of the tax law with respect to the New Hampshire Sweepstakes is ambiguous, contradictory, and somewhat irrational. Congress did not consider the specific situation of a State conducted sweepstakes at the time of passage of the Internal Revenue Code for the simple reason that no such sweepstakes were in existence at that time. Now that the citizens of the State of New Hampshire have voted overwhelmingly to endorse a sweepstakes, it is time for the Congress to clarify the Internal Revenue Code and provide for a specific exemption.

Mr. President, the New Hampshire sweepstakes was conceived as a well thought out plan to increase the fund available for the use of our State's edu-

cational system. Such fiscal experiments on the part of States interested in obtaining more money for educational purposes should be encouraged, and not discouraged, by our Federal tax laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SHORTAGE OF COINS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE HEARING AT 10 A.M. TOMORROW, JULY 21

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we have a shortage of coins that is both critical and unnecessary.

On June 25, 1964, I introduced S. 2950, a bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure 1964 on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available.

This bill has been endorsed by the Treasury Department, the Director of the Mint, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In each of the past 3 fiscal years, 1961, 1962, and 1963, the mint has established a new production record for domestic coins, and yet the normal flow of coins from the mint to the Federal Reserve System to the marketplace and back to the banks has not been maintained.

In normal times, the return flow of coins for redistribution was nine times as great as the number of new coins received from the mint by the Federal Reserve banks. Now, however, the return flow is sharply reduced and the number of coins coming from the mint exceeds the number returning from circulation.

This disruption of our normal circulation pattern has forced banks to ration coins to assure a fair distribution of the available supply. Merchants who depend on coins for change in their daily operations complain that they have been cut to as much as 25 percent of their normal coin requirements. Some say they have been forced to buy coins from other businesses at premiums of up to 10 percent.

There is every indication that the shortage will grow worse before action that has been initiated by the Government to correct it can become effective.

This action includes:

First. An increase in mint facilities. An addition to the Denver Mint is scheduled for completion this fall and both the Senate and the House have approved a budget request of \$16 million for a new mint at Philadelphia.

Second. New coin presses are being acquired from surplus Government supplies and private industry.

Third. There is continuous 7-day, 24-hour production at our mints in Denver and Philadelphia.

Fourth. The mint is now purchasing rolled nickel and bronze strips, ready for blanking, from private industry. This permits the mint to use all of its melting and rolling capacity for silver coins only, greatly increasing the output of all denominations.

S. 2950 is an additional measure to help solve this coin shortage problem.

The Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Mint, and the Federal Reserve Board believe that the retention of the date "1964" on all coins will discourage the hoarding of vast numbers of coins by coin dealers and collectors. The sheer number of the coins will make them less valuable to collectors and dealers. This bill is being opposed by many of them.

The hoarding of coins by dealers and collectors is, of course, not the only cause of this coin shortage, but it is a factor which must be considered in any attempt to solve the problem. I have been informed that individual collectors who in the past have been content with one coin of a special kind are now buying rolls and even bags of coins.

Dealers are advertising bags and rolls of 1964 uncirculated coins for sale at premium prices and the advertisements do not specify any limit on the amounts which may be purchased.

The economic effect of a severe coin shortage to our banks, stores, turnpike authorities, vending machine companies and other businesses is very grave. The impact that this bill will have on coin collectors and dealers in this country must be weighed against this economic fact.

It is clear that this bill is needed by the Government to help solve this very critical coin shortage.

There will be hearings commencing at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning on Senate bill 2950.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "FBI Chief Sees No Change in Reds," published in the Times & Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., on July 12, 1964.

THE INFLATIONARY DANGER OF PLANNED DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 20, 1964, issue of Newsweek there was published a most thought-provoking article, written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, entitled "Dread of a Surplus."

In this article, Mr. Hazlitt calls attention to the policy of the present administration of deliberately planning deficit spending and points out the inflationary dangers of such a fiscally irresponsible program.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article, entitled "Dread of a Surplus," written by Mr. Hazlitt, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREAD OF A SURPLUS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The last fiscal year ended on June 30 with a deficit of about \$8.8 billion. This was

more than the entire amount spent by Franklin D. Roosevelt in any fiscal year till 1939. It will be followed by a deficit in the current fiscal year officially estimated at \$5.8 billion (and it will probably be much larger). The two deficits taken together will be the biggest for any 2-year period in peacetime.

Yet no one showed any particular concern about this. The New York Times report hailed it as a great achievement. "The deficits in the last 3 years, while believed to have spurred the economy, have clearly not been inflationary."

Most of the comment, indeed, has been to the effect that the deficit has not merely been harmless, but beneficial. And this reflects the present administration's own underlying fiscal philosophy, which is that a budget balance should be attempted only when the economy is at the level of full employment. This it defines as unemployment of 4 percent or less of the labor force. The President's economic advisers have often expressed their conviction that previous efforts to balance the budget when the economy was operating with idle plant and idle labor only prolonged and increased unemployment.

Because of this fiscal philosophy the present administration does not expect to see the budget balanced until the fiscal year 1967, which ends 3 years from now.

WHY BALANCE EVER?

But if the administration's economic assumptions are correct, why balance the budget even then—or at any time? If the country is enjoying full employment, as a result of deficit spending, why needlessly endanger that prosperity by returning to a budget balance?

We can be sure that, if ever the blessed full-employment goal were achieved, this argument would be put forward. And it is hard to see how it could be politically resisted. In fact, there are already commentators who contend that the Government cannot afford ever again to run a surplus, and that balanced budgets are economic suicide.

It is instructive to recall the series of rationalizations that have brought us to this point. At first it was argued that a balanced budget was harmful only in "bad" years. The necessity of balancing the budget was accepted, but it should be only a cyclical balance over a series of years. But the cyclical theorists never revealed how long their cycle was, or how they or anyone else could know at any time just where we were in a cycle. If an average cycle is 6 years, say, then to offset the expected cumulative 3-year budget deficit of \$21 billion at the end of this fiscal year there would have to be an average \$7 billion surplus in each of the next 3 years. The professed cyclical balancers would be appalled at such a prospect.

THIRTY-FOUR YEARS, 28 DEFICITS

So their theory is now that we should always run a budget deficit as long as there is any unemployment. And though we have already run 28 deficits in the last 34 years, they deplore only the six surpluses.

What will be the result if their theories continue to be followed? It was crushingly demonstrated in the thirties that even heavy uninterrupted deficits cannot cure mass unemployment. But more deficits can and must lead to further increase in the National debt, further increase in the money supply, a further rise of prices, and a further depreciation of the dollar. The purchasing power of the dollar has already been reduced 63 percent since 1933 and 43 percent since 1945.

It is true that in the last 10 years the dollar has depreciated only 12 percent. But this result looks good only in comparison with the dreadful international record. The New York First National City Bank's annual

review of comparative rates of depreciation shows that in the last 10 years the German mark has lost 18 percent of its purchasing power, the British pound 23 percent, the Italian lira 25 percent, the French franc 34 percent, and the Argentine, Brazilian, Chilean, and Bolivian currencies respectively, 91, 94, 95, and 97 percent.

Whether the deficits are planned or unplanned, the result is always the same.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 10, 1964, issues of the Washington Evening Star and the Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., there were published two editorials, both criticizing the Senate Rules Committee and its apparent effort to whitewash the Baker investigation.

Both these editorials agree that the investigation is far from a full disclosure, and point out that the majority membership of the committee must accept the responsibility for having made these scandals a political issue.

As one who recognizes that the overwhelming percentage of the membership of the Democratic Party are honest, loyal Americans, I am sure that they will agree that the Rules Committee's decision to stop this investigation short of a full disclosure is most unfortunate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the Washington Evening Star on Friday, July 10, entitled "Still a Whitewash," and the editorial published in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal on that same date, entitled "Baker Report Is Incomplete," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 10, 1964]

STILL A WHITEWASH

Chairman JORDAN, commenting on his committee's investigation of the Bobby Baker case, says he feels "ennobled by the dedication of my colleagues and the high caliber of their performance." We can't imagine why the head of the Senate Rules Committee would say such a thing. For the committee's investigation from the opening day to the final report has been a whitewash. It reflects discredit on the committee and leaves grave doubt respecting the integrity of the Senate.

True, the report comes down hard on Bobby Baker—as it should. We hope that further action can be taken against him, either through criminal procedures or through some such civil action as that proposed by New Jersey's Senator CASE. Even if something of this sort materializes, however, the strong impression will remain that Bobby Baker is the scapegoat of this investigation—that he is being made to take the rap while other and more important figures go untouched.

We agree thoroughly with the minority report that the whole story of the Bobby Baker case has not been told because the Democrats on the committee voted against a full and determined investigation, in which all appropriate witnesses could be heard. We further agree that any investigation of alleged misconduct "which has

brought shame and reproach on the U.S. Senate" should be "thorough, complete and exhaustive."

This has not been true in this instance. Let's take just one example.

A principal witness was Don Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, who claims he paid for a stereo set given by Baker to the then majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, and also that he was pressured into buying some \$1,200 worth of (to him) useless advertising time on the L.B.J. network in Texas. Mr. Reynolds added that Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Mr. Johnson, was involved in the advertising deal. Mr. Jenkins told committee staff members that he had nothing to do with the arrangements for the advertising. But somebody did.

The committee heard the insurance salesman in closed session. But Mr. Reynolds' request to testify, under oath, in public session was rejected. Why?

The report implies that the committee was skeptical of his testimony, although it was supported by documentary evidence. But if the committee majority turned down the request from Mr. Reynolds because it thought he was given to flights of fancy, what about Mr. Jenkins? Why was he not called to testify publicly and under oath? Surely the committee would not want anyone to draw the inference that Mr. Jenkins might be an unreliable witness.

The conclusion, we think, is plain enough. The committee did not want to put the facts of these transactions on the open record and therefore they were covered up.

Ennobling?

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, July 10, 1964]

BAKER REPORT IS INCOMPLETE

The majority report on the Bobby Baker investigation makes it clear not only that the investigation was never completed, but the majority on the Senate Rules Committee never had any intention of completing it properly and responsibly.

How could the report be complete in view of that fact that the Democratic majority (six) refused to call a single witness requested by the minority (three) of the committee?

The majority did see fit to declare Baker guilty of "gross improprieties," and to detail a number of them. But the majority members expose themselves to warranted criticism by Republicans and others. The report in forthright fashion makes Baker out to be a self-seeking opportunist who didn't hesitate to use "his Senate office as if it were a private business office," and who used "the prestige of his official position to obtain participation in many business ventures."

The report presents an affidavit from Walter Jenkins, President Johnson's longtime assistant, denying the charge that he (Jenkins) put pressure on a Washington insurance man to take advertising time on the Johnson family's TV station in Texas in return for insurance sold to the then Senator Lyndon Johnson. But somebody was lying, or badly confused to say the least. It may be observed that cross-questioning of Jenkins along with the insurance agent under oath might have produced information pertinent to the work of drafting a code of ethics for senatorial behavior in future. The same Senate Rules Committee is presently faced with this unpalatable but necessary task.

The Republicans—including especially U.S. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (not on the Rules Committee) are entitled to take careful aim at the Bobby Baker report and make whatever political hay from it they can. That goes without saying. Any and all Americans truly devoted to good government, whatever

their party, can help to make sure that the U.S. Senate does not offer a roosting place in future for any such a fancy bird as Robert G. Baker.

Nor, we may add, does his present status as the most noted motel operator of Ocean City, Md., necessarily make him the pride of the Delmarva Peninsula.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have pointed out on the Senate floor on several occasions that the National Council of Churches has been consistently violating the law with regard to its tax-exempt status by engaging in lobbying and political activity throughout the country. In vain I have called on the Internal Revenue Service to make a thorough investigation of this matter so that the law can properly be enforced in accordance with the will of the Congress in writing into our tax laws specific prohibitions against such activities by organizations which are granted this special privilege of a tax-exempt status. I have been supported in my contentions by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I have also had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 12, 1964, a letter from the then chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Mr. Colin F. Stam, pointing out that his study of the questions relating to specific lobbying activities by the National Council of Churches indicates that the National Council of Churches tax-exempt status may be "in jeopardy."

Evidently, my efforts have not been completely in vain, as the National Observer has taken enough interest in this question to publish a detailed article on church lobbying in the July 13, 1964, issue. This article was written by Mr. Lee E. Dirks, and examines in some detail lobbying pressures, techniques, and activities of the National Council of Churches and other similar groups not only on the recently passed so-called civil rights legislation, but in other areas and specifically in the upcoming anti-poverty legislation.

I was amazed to read in this article that the National Council of Churches plans to spend considerable time and effort in lobbying in support of the so-called anti-poverty legislation, even though it violates in several particulars the principle of separation of church and state which has been used by the National Council of Churches and other church groups to try to stop passage of a proposed amendment to the Constitution to permit voluntary nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in the public schools as existed prior to recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. President, this article on lobbying by the church groups should be read by every Member of the Congress, and specifically by the leadership in the Internal Revenue Service. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks this article from the National

Observer, together with an article from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated July 5, 1964, on this same subject by Mr. William D. Workman, and an editorial from the Columbia Record of July 18, 1964, entitled "Churches Are Political Lobbies."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, July 5, 1964]

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

(By W. D. Workman)

A grave threat to church membership in the South is a sociopolitical action agency with the high-sounding but misleading name of the National Council of Churches.

The hierarchy of that organization includes a host of compulsive meddlers who are undertaking to reorder both the thinking and the conduct of American citizens. The assertion that they are backed by some 39 million church men and women of the United States is a gross distortion of fact and abuse of position.

Unfortunately, a considerable number of Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations of America are affiliated with the national council. Even more unhappily, many leaders within those separate denominations do subscribe to the principles and policies of the council, sometimes using it as a forum to expound views they might not advocate within their own more democratic bodies.

But the rank and file of church membership, especially among southern Protestant churches, disagree violently with the national council's ultraliberal views and resent the constant and calculated inferences that they are represented by the council. At long last, the time seems at hand for these southerners to make a clean and clear break with the national council if they are to preserve their individual self-respect, their congregational identity, and their churchly effectiveness.

PROMOTING STRIFE

The straw that may have broken the back of long-suffering southerners was the national council's sponsorship of the Ohio training school which is dispatching hundreds of young men and women, black and white, upon troubling missions into the South. The disappearance of three such workers in Mississippi seems not to have any sobering effect upon the national council, and the expeditionary force continues to move south.

The National Council of Churches in effect has declared war upon the State of Mississippi and presumably upon the rest of the South where racial separation is either practiced or preferred.

The council is deliberately fomenting discord and civil disobedience, and doing so in the name of Christianity. The action is consistent with earlier positions taken by the council and its constituent agencies.

Earlier this year, the Council's Emergency Commission on Religion and Race sponsored a youth ministry consultation on race at Nashville. Meeting at the headquarters of the Methodist General Board of Education, the delegates were told that young people should become involved (one said "blooded") in demonstrations for racial equality.

DABBLING IN POLITICS

But the National Council's adamant stand for racial mixing is not the only position it has taken in an effort to influence political decisions and governmental action. In a brazen repudiation of the traditional American concept of church-state separation, the council has maintained lobbyists, sponsored demonstrations, stimulated letter-writing campaigns and in general rallied the full force of its organization in support of the

civil rights legislation adopted by the 1964 Congress.

As far back as 1957, one of the council's agencies described segregation as "a tragic evil that is utterly un-Christian."

But despite this presumed concern over Christian conduct, another council agency (the Fifth World Order Study Conference) favored our diplomatic recognition of Red China and the admission of that godless, anti-Christian, Communist country to the United Nations.

HUNTING FOR HEADLINES

But the bill of particulars against the National Council neither starts nor stops with the citations above. The council, its officers, or its agencies have offended the sensibilities or the convictions of countless churchmen with such pronouncements or positions as the following:

A request (by Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, when president of the National Council) asking general financial support for the legal defense and educational fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The selection of the Reverend Martin L. King as the author of the council's 1957 Race Relations Sunday message.

A condemnation of right-to-work laws. Opposition to the movie "Operation Abolition," which portrays Communist-directed efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Promulgation of a "reading list" containing authors identified with pornography, atheism, or communism.

There may be areas of activities in which the National Council of Churches renders a genuine service to Christianity. But when it indulges in pressure politics, sociological meddling, international appeasement, and domestic troublemaking, the council forfeits whatever right it might claim to speak for American Protestants, especially those of the South.

[From the National Observer, July 13, 1964]
CHURCH LOBBYISTS STEP UP PRESSURE, SCOUT NEW FIELDS—HOW THE MEN OF THE CLOTH OPERATE ON CAPITOL HILL—DOUBTS IN THE PEWS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Call religious lobbying on Capitol Hill improper, or call it courageous. It goes on—and it's growing.

Church groups applied the weight that tipped the balance for passage of the civil rights bill, and religious pressure killed the proposed school prayer amendment. Now the church lobby is getting ready for the legislative fight over poverty.

Priests, ministers, and rabbis whose faces are familiar in the Halls of Congress have joined Walter Reuther's citizens committee on poverty. Washington-based churchmen are beginning to mobilize letterwriting campaigns urging Congress to pass strong anti-poverty legislation.

The church, in coming months, will beam its voice onto a stronger frequency on such issues as foreign aid, immigration, and disarmament; interfaith support for a huge New York convocation next February to study the late Pope John XXIII's encyclical on peace may herald a stronger peace campaign in Congress by the churches. All the while the drumfire will persist on civil rights.

WILL PLEAD FOR FUNDS

In San Francisco last week Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and first vice president of the National Council of Churches, went before the Republican platform committee to urge vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. When Congressmen return to Washington after the GOP convention, they'll hear churchmen plead for President Johnson's request for funds to help enforce the bill.

Clergymen already are serving on the advisory committee of the new Community Relations Service, which is working behind the scenes to encourage compliance.

The churches, by every account, played a decisive role in the civil rights struggle in Congress. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic floor manager for the bill, termed them "the most important force at work" on behalf of the measure. The leader of the Southern forces, Georgia's Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, blamed the bill's passage on pressure from President Johnson and many of the Nation's clergy.

"This is the second time in my lifetime an effort has been made by the clergy to make a moral question of a political issue," recalled Senator RUSSELL minutes before the Senate voted to shut off debate. "The other was prohibition. We know something of the results of that."

A moral issue the clergy unquestionably sought to make it. And the emphasis on the "moral," as opposed to the "political," is one of the elements that distinguishes the "new look" of church lobbying in Washington.

HIS FIRST BATTLE STARS

"You can always fight 'politics,'" asserts a young lobbyist of the cloth who, like many of his associates, earned his first battle stars in the civil rights campaign. "But it's difficult as hell to fight 'morality.'"

The theme will be repeated on the poverty fight. "Modern technology is increasingly bringing within man's possibilities the elimination of poverty," declares the National Council of Churches, whose member churches comprise two-thirds of American Protestantism. "Poverty is therefore ethically intolerable. The persistence of poverty has become a matter for which men are morally responsible."

Catholics and Jews confide that they too will stress the "moral" aspect of the poverty problem. In their common approach, the three faiths demonstrate another element of the new look in church lobbying.

The oldtime superficial "brotherhood" has vanished—victim of a new era of candid discussion among the faiths. Confesses one Protestant: "Before, when we faced an issue, we used to ask, 'Where are the Catholics?' Then we'd take the opposite position."

UNPRECEDENTED TESTIMONY

Now Washington spokesmen for the three faiths wrestle with the issues and disagree when they must. But hard reasoning on the civil rights bill resulted in the unprecedented joint testimony before Congress by national leaders of all three faiths a year ago. And frank conversations now undergird the churches' growing interest in speaking out on such broad issues as poverty and peace.

No longer, in fact, do churches lobby largely to protect their own interests—as on social security for the clergy, for example. No longer do they speak incessantly on issues dear to their own theology—alcohol, say, or gambling—and remain silent on larger concerns.

But the new look applies not merely to church offices in the shadow of the Capitol. It applies to church conventions in Denver and Des Moines. It applies to pastors and their congregations in Hackensack and Sacramento. "We don't get the question, 'What are you doing lobbying?' any more," declares James Hamilton, 32-year-old civil rights strategist for the National Council of Churches in Washington. "Instead they're asking, 'What more can we do?'"

HOW THE LOBBYING WORKS

Church lobbying has many shades, many forms. It can be as direct as a straight pitch to a Congressman in the privacy of his office or as subtle as a bishop's impromptu comment to the press hundreds of miles away.

Its practitioners may openly acknowledge they're trying to influence votes, or they may speak in euphemisms about "keeping our people back home informed."

Drop into the second-floor offices of the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) at 2d and C Streets NE., in the Capitol Hill section. There's no effort there to disguise activities with euphemisms, no uneasiness over the job they're doing. Declares the Friends' E. Raymond Wilson, dean of Washington's church lobbyists: "Lobbying is as American as hamburgers or the Fourth of July."

Mr. Wilson deplors what he believes is the prevalent public view "of a partially eclipsed God who can shed His light on missionary activities in Cambodia and the Congo, but not on Congress. Not that church bodies speak with the full wisdom of God, but Members of Congress do need the warmth of religious fellowship."

SIX HUNDRED "INTERVIEWS" IN 1963

Congress, it's evident from a huge wall chart in FCNL offices, feels the warmth of Quaker fellowship. The chart shows every Member of Congress, the dates Quakers visited them or their assistants in 1963 and 1964, and the subjects discussed. FCNL staff members or volunteers held more than 600 "interviews" with Congress in 1963.

Mr. Wilson helped form the FCNL in November 1943, when the Pacifist Friends were especially concerned about protecting the interests of conscientious objectors in the draft. The FCNL, Mr. Wilson proudly recalls, was "the first full-time legislative staff of a religious denomination to work on the three jobs of lobbying: Sending out information to its members and bringing them to Washington; getting out in the field to discuss the issues; lobbying in the narrow sense—interviewing Members of Congress intensively and testifying before legislative committees."

Of the more than 1,000 lobbyists registered under the Lobbying Act of 1946, only 5 are religious lobbyists—and 3 of these are staff members of the FCNL. The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, soon to be absorbed by the new department of social responsibility of the Unitarian Universalist Association, is the only other registered religious lobbyist associated with a denomination. The fifth religious lobbyist: The Christian Amendment Movement, sponsors of a proposed constitutional amendment that would commit America to "the authority and law of Jesus Christ." The amendment is introduced and pigeonholed in Congress perennially.

FEW REGISTER AS LOBBYISTS

Most churchmen on Capitol Hill don't register as lobbyists because, they contend, they're not lobbyists in the usual sense. They distinguish between lobbying for one's own interests—the type pursued by labor unions, companies, and trade associations—and lobbying for what they construe as the interests of society.

"We're not concerned about partisan benefits that may come to the church as an institution," explains the Rev. A. Dudley Ward, general secretary of the Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns. "Furthermore, the Members of Congress have a right to expect the persons who are supposed to represent the moral consensus of the Nation—or the lack of moral consensus—to speak out."

On balance, Washington churchmen speak very little to Congressmen themselves and far more to their members back home. "I'm ashamed to admit this," confided one Protestant "lobbyist" last week, "but I didn't see a single Senator or Congressman during the whole civil rights thing."

The Reverend H. B. Sissel, Washington spokesman for the United Presbyterians,

made a "deliberate and calculated" decision not to visit Congressmen himself. Mr. Sissel doubts the church lobbyist can be effective: "He has no votes, no money, no technical information to offer." What's more, Mr. Sissel believes he can spend his time more productively enlisting support among people who do have influence on Congressmen—their constituents.

GROWTH IN PUBLICATIONS

Church offices have mushroomed in Washington in postwar years; more than a dozen groups maintain full-time representatives, and others, such as the Episcopalians, have men who visit the Capitol regularly from other cities. But the greatest growth has occurred not in personnel, but in publications.

From the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs streams "position papers" on almost every nuance of the continuing church-state debate. From the imposing 10-story headquarters of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), the nerve center of Catholicism in the United States, pour influential statements on social welfare, education, peace, and family life.

Inevitably, these "education" efforts have an impact on Congress. An NCWC priest once told of a Congressman who was disturbed because he had learned too late the NCWC position on the Taft-Hartley Act; due to the poor timing, the Congressman said, he had voted the "wrong" way. This year many Catholic legislators suffered similar distress when they supported the proposed school-prayer amendment, only to have the NCWC come out against it.

To see how one Washington church "lobby" mobilizes its resources in the context of the new look, trace the activities of the Washington office of the National Council of Churches on behalf of the civil rights bill. The action began in June 1963, when the general board of the national council created a Commission on Religion and Race.

The commission received a three-part mandate from the general board: Urge denominations to desegregate their own institutions, help churches aid in the desegregation of communities, and work for meaningful civil rights legislation. Jim Hamilton, a husky graduate of George Washington Law School and a 5½-year veteran of the Washington staff, was drafted to work full time on civil rights.

The National Council strategists quickly reached four crucial decisions:

Cooperate with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, a loose confederation of about 80 organizations ranging from fraternal societies to labor unions.

Work informally with Washington lobbies of individual denominations, issuing statements on a trifaith basis where possible.

Formulate trifaith testimony for early delivery before Congress, and follow up with visits to key legislators by the religious leaders testifying.

Concentrate field work on the Midwest and Rocky Mountain regions, where labor unions and other traditional supporters of strong civil rights legislation were weak.

The Midwestern and Mountain States, the national council knew, had sent a number of Congressmen to the House who were uncommitted on civil rights; they possessed a huge bloc of uncommitted votes in the Senate. And so, less than a month after the march on Washington in late August, the suspenseful campaign for support—support where it counted—began.

PRODDING CHURCH LEADERS

To Lincoln, Nebr., for a 2-day meeting, the national council brought 150 top church leaders from 13 States. The purpose: To help them understand, in Mr. Hamilton's words, "the dimensions of their involvement

in the civil rights legislative fight," and to prod them into planning how to enlist support in their home States. Similar 1-day meetings were held in succeeding weeks in Denver, Indianapolis, and several smaller cities.

In October, four-man teams roved Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota—five States that held critical votes in the House. On each team were a minister (to speak of the religious motivation for concern over civil rights legislation), a Negro youth (to say, Mr. Hamilton explains, "I've been through it—and it's hell"), a legislative expert (to describe the bill), and a contact man from the State council of churches.

The teams toured the breakfast and luncheon circuit, encouraging clergymen and laymen to return to their churches and enlist others in telephone and telegram appeals to their Congressmen, or even to organize delegations to visit their Congressmen in Washington. Where they could, the teams called on other faiths for help; a rabbi participated in Sioux City, Iowa, a priest in Dubuque.

All the while, the national council was pumping out fact sheets on the bill as it progressed through the House. The periodic reports went to about 5,200 church leaders.

SENT JOINT TELEGRAMS

In Washington, Mr. Hamilton was joining leadership conference delegations visiting key Congressmen on the House Judiciary Subcommittee—GEORGE MEADER, of Michigan, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland. Twice while the bill was in the House, the three faiths sent joint telegrams (on public accommodations and on fair employment) signed by prominent national spokesmen.

The House passed the bill in February; every Illinois Congressman voted for it, and so did two of Nebraska's three Congressmen. Within days Iowa-bred Jim Hamilton was back in the hustings, this time in the Great Plains. The Reverend Jay Moore, from the Commission on Religion and Race, visited the Mountain States.

This time they met with smaller groups—groups of 20 or so. They recorded tapes to circulate among the churches. And they began to spot signs that their earlier work was paying off.

In Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a power executive told Mr. Hamilton he had spoken with Senator KARL E. MUNDT in South Dakota the previous weekend and would see him again in Washington that week. When Mr. Hamilton visited Nebraska "to tell them to tighten up" on Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA and Senator CARL T. CURTIS, a State Council of Churches leader told him they had already been buttonholed. Newspaper ads signed by churchmen began to appear in influential newspapers—in Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER's hometown of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for example.

OPENING A 24-HOUR VIGIL

The stretch drive opened on April 28, when 6,300 churchmen from around the Nation jammed Georgetown University's McDonough Auditorium in Washington for the National Inter-Religious Convocation on Civil Rights. The next day, daily services sponsored by the Commission on Religion and Race (a counterpoint to the Senate filibuster) began at a Lutheran church on Capitol Hill; the services continued, with attendance as high as 270 and as low as 2, until the bill passed. At the Lincoln Memorial, theological students representing more than 100 seminaries—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—opened a 24-hour vigil for civil rights legislation.

"Yes, I know, I know . . . the seminaries," interrupted a Senator when one seminary student started to explain the purpose of his visit.

On May 18, the day after the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, 260 churchmen from 43 States assembled at the Lutheran church, marched to the Supreme Court for a brief prayer, and then visited their Congressmen. Soon afterward, three national council men, including Mr. Hamilton, struck out for the Great Plains to urge churchmen to make a last-minute pitch.

The harvest was plentiful. Voting for closure were both Senators from Iowa, both from Nebraska, both from Kansas, both from South Dakota. Many factors influenced votes in both Houses of Congress, but for some Congressmen, religious pressure was the decisive one. Grumbled a Kansas conservative in the House just before the vote: "I'd like to vote against it, but I can't. The church groups are on my tail."

THE CHURCH REACHED OUT

"Who knows who had what influence we had, or why?" muses a contemplative Mr. Hamilton as he gazes at a wall map of congressional districts. "We only know this: It wasn't just the church operating as a church. It was the church operating in lay fields, involving the business community, reaching into the power structure."

It was, in short, the classic political pattern. In one city, it was a huddle with the Red Feather man who knows the community power structure; a pitch to a Methodist minister followed, and the minister in turn contacted the president of the largest bank in the State, who promised to contact a Senator. In other cities, other persons were involved, but the pattern was the same.

"We kept churning," says Mr. Hamilton. "We kept saying, 'We gotta do something this week, next week. We gotta keep the boiler going.'" The Catholics he says, were more conservative in their approach, "perhaps more wise."

The Catholics relied on a network of more than 55 Catholic interracial councils to build grassroots support for the bill. Only in May did they organize a major Midwest conference sweeping across state lines and pulling in delegates from 50 dioceses. In Washington NCWC priests refrained from extensive visits to legislators. "We had the feeling you could overdo the Roman collar around Capitol Hill," says one NCWC priest.

USED THE BLANKET APPROACH

Some Protestant denominations felt no such restraint. More than once the Episcopalians brought several score churchmen to the Capitol; they used the "blanket" approach, reporting one time they saw 400 of the 435 House Members. A United Church of Christ "Witness in Washington" in March attracted more than 100 people, who fanned out to see Senators from 22 key States. More than one denomination paid the travel expenses of some of their volunteer churchmen.

If the church lobbies harvested votes, they harvested criticism, too. Charging that the national council was "engaging in political activity of a lobbying nature" in violation of its tax-exempt status, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, last March demanded an Internal Revenue Service inquiry.

The controversy hinges on one word in the Internal Revenue Code: Religious organizations qualify for tax exemption if no "substantial" part of its activities involve propaganda or efforts to influence legislation. What is "substantial?"

The only guideline is a 1955 case in which the court indicated that, if "less than 5 percent of the time and effort" of the organization were devoted to "political" activities, these activities would not be considered "substantial." The national council points out that less than 1 percent of its budget goes to its Commission on Religion and Race, and

only a part of this sum went to support of the civil rights bill.

WITHHOLDING PAYMENTS

Scores of southern churches associated with the national council have been withholding their payments in protest over national council activities on civil rights. A Thurmond aid echoes their sentiments: "We stand against everything the national council stands for, except preaching the Gospel—and they don't do much of that."

The revolt probably won't spread much beyond the South and Southwest, but it expresses the extreme of a second criticism against church lobbying: What right do churches have to spend money from the collection plates for purposes individual members oppose?

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), the most aggressive lobby on the Hill, avoids this criticism as neatly as it avoids the first. As a registered lobbyist, it claims no tax exemption. And as a group independent from the Religious Society of Friends, receiving financial support from separate sources, it spends no loose bills dropped into collection plates.

"The FCNL speaks for itself and for like-minded Friends," it declares in its testimony and in its newsletter. "No organization can speak officially for the Religious Society of Friends." Many church lobbies make similar disclaimers and some—the Committee for Racial Justice Now of the United Church of Christ, for example—collect their funds from special offerings.

SENATOR THURMOND'S WARNING

A fear of the churches will muddy still further the murky waters of church-state relationships disturbs some critics of church lobbying. "Keep your church out of politics," Senator THURMOND warned a group of Methodist lawyers in North Carolina recently. "But you—you as individual Christians—should work to use your influence politically."

Counters America magazine, a voice of liberal Catholicism: "Separation of church and state has never been interpreted to mean the insulation of lawmaking from the moral demands of religious faith."

Finally, critics wonder where the churches will draw the line between proper and improper concerns. The church-inspired Anti-Saloon League, during its heyday in the first two decades of the 20th century, unashamedly delivered and withheld votes on the basis of a single criterion: How the candidate voted on temperance. Complained one writer in 1919: "The average Member of Congress is more afraid of the Anti-Saloon League than he is even of the President of the United States."

MR. WILSON'S ARGUMENT

The Friends' Mr. Wilson and his more timid associates in other denominations seek no return to the days of the Anti-Saloon League. Mr. Wilson argues that it's improper for churches to endorse political parties or candidates, or to permit political meetings to be held on their grounds.

But Mr. Wilson rebukes his colleagues for a lobbying stance he believes is still too meek. "The churches haven't been doing 10 percent of what they should be doing on social action," he complains. Seven representative Protestant denominations, he calculates, spend from 4 to 19 cents per member each year—"the cost of an ice cream cone or a Coca-Cola"—on social action.

Rumblings on Capitol Hill indicate Mr. Wilson may be swimming against the tide, at least in terms of congressional sentiment. "We hear a lot of talk on the Hill that it was okay to push hard on the civil rights bill—the moral bit, and all that—but we'd better

not try it on poverty," reports one church lobbyist.

IT WAS AN UNAMBIGUOUS ISSUE

Some churchmen, like some legislators, are uncomfortable about any consistent church alliance with labor. They warn, too, that any antipoverty program must be a complex package of legislation, with any number of church-state traps that could divide opinion sharply among the faithful. "Civil rights had the virtue of being a completely unambiguous issue in terms of Christian implications," says Dr. Lewis I. Maddocks, of the United Church of Christ.

But the central question remains. What is the proper role of the church on Capitol Hill? "The answer has been rewritten this past year," says the national council's Mr. Hamilton. "I hope it has been rewritten unalterably."

If it has, the National Council of Churches has another rewriting job to do. For in the simple statement of purposes of its Washington office remain these words written several years ago: "The Washington office as such is not to engage in efforts to influence legislation."

[From the Columbia Record, July 18, 1964]

CHURCHES ARE POLITICAL LOBBIES

Church organizations have become one of the most powerful pressure groups on Capitol Hill.

This was admitted when Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY credited and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL blamed the churches as "the most important force at work" in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Religious lobbies of the three major faiths, encouraged by their success with that measure and against the proposed school prayer amendment, plan to conduct other political crusades, beginning with an effort to pass the administration's poverty bill.

They will cloak political schemes with the mantle of "moral issues," including such projects as foreign aid, immigration, and disarmament as well as strong "civil rights" implementation.

"You can always fight 'politics,'" one of the lobbying clergymen explained, "but it's as difficult as hell to fight 'morality.'"

Some U.S. Senators found that out recently. A comprehensive report on church lobbying in the National Observer details the classic political pattern used by the National Council of Churches to win over Legislators for the "civil rights" cause.

Senators MUNDT, of South Dakota; HRUSKA and CURTIS, of Nebraska; and HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, were specific targets.

A Kansas Representative admitted, "I'd like to vote against the 'civil rights' bill, but I can't. The church groups are on my tail."

Church lobbyists, with small exception, are not among the thousand lobbyists registered under the Lobbying Act of 1946. They escape on the technicality of the budget percentage spent on political activities.

The forthright Quakers have registered their Friends Committee on National Legislation. The committee claims no religious tax exemption. It is financed by separate funds, in contrast with unregistered church lobbies which receive their money from church collection plates.

Political participation is enjoying a wave of popularity among clergymen who are themselves subjected to a constant stream of political propaganda from religious headquarters.

But many persons are inclined to agree with Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who told a group of religious lobbyists from another State, "Keep your church out of politics. But you—you as individual Christians—should work to use your influence politically."

THE NEED TO END MILITARY WASTE OF MANPOWER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York Times recently printed an editorial emphasizing the disgraceful situation which now exists for those who are serving in our Armed Forces. The legislation which this body passed recently which provides increased pay for civil service employees and other Government workers makes the contrast with the very low pay of our Armed Forces all the more conspicuous.

As the editorial points out "pay alone is never enough." In other words pay should not be the only incentive for serving one's country. Yet just this week I received a letter from an enlisted man who declared that after being drafted and trained as a radio operator he was assigned to a golf driving range. For 13 hours a day he drives around on a small tractor picking up about 3,000 golf balls a week. A whole squad is employed in keeping this officer's golf course and driving range in condition. When our Army uses drafted men to maintain golf courses, the time for reforming our entire military manpower system has come.

Mr. President, I have already proposed that a bipartisan commission be set up by the President to investigate the manpower needs of our armed services and the best way to fulfill these needs, whether by continuing the draft or by voluntary recruitment. A committee working in the Pentagon could hardly be unbiased. An independent Presidential commission would be far more appropriate.

It is a serious waste to draft young men to do nothing but menial or unnecessary tasks. Our young people can do many valuable things for our country—picking up golf balls is not one of them.

I hope the Congress of the United States will take this matter very seriously and work quickly to assure that inequalities and abuses in the present system are eliminated as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this New York Times editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY "PAY GAP"

The latest Federal pay increase for civilian employees widens the "pay gap" between civilian and military pay.

The military pay increase approved last year was originally predicated on the basis of "comparability" with government civilian and private industrial pay scales, but this principle was ignored in the final legislation. Last year's pay raise did a great deal to make up for years of neglect—but by no means enough. When the bill was passed Secretary McNamara committed himself and his department to further annual adjustment of service pay scales. But such adjustment has not been pressed this year and, except for endorsement of a 2½ percent increase by the Senate Armed Services Committee, Congress has taken no action in this session.

Yet the dimensions of the problem are increasing year by year. As Senator GAYLORD NELSON has pointed out, last year's military pay raise did not affect beginning pay. An

entering private still receives \$78 per month as compared to \$112 a month in Canada; obviously the inducement to volunteer is low. Some 71,000 enlisted men and officers in the Air Force alone are forced to "moonlight," according to the Air Force Times, to supplement their service pay. At least 5,000 Air Force enlisted men, who earn less than \$3,000 annually, are depending upon welfare programs of various sorts to help provide for their families.

These and other statistics which will undoubtedly astonish the American public constitute, as Senator KEATING says, "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country."

Pay alone is never enough—nor should it be the primary incentive for the uniformed services. Yet service rewards and emoluments—tangible and intangible—are not adequate to promote professionalism, or to foster what Capt. William A. Golden, USN, calls "a credible incentive." In a bitter article in the July issue of the Naval Institute Proceedings, Captain Golden predicts that, unless present conditions change, "by 1973 we will have an officer corps generated from a quarter of a century of poor procurement and retention—poorly educated, dissatisfied, and ill-equipped to man" the new and technologically complicated Navy. He concludes on behalf of the professional officers and enlisted men of all the services:

"It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannot be paid like busboys, worked like field hands, and released like old, slow halfbacks—not because it is not legal, but because it simply is not good business."

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, too little attention is given to one of our permanent national academies, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy located at Kings Point, Long Island. For 21 years it has been training officers to serve in the merchant marine of the United States and in the course of that time it has graduated 12,000 men.

Certainly, much of the success of this institution must be attributed to its superintendent, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock.

For 17 years he has directed the school's teaching staff of 92 and its non-teaching staff of 172.

A recent article in the New York Times discusses the history of the school and the dedicated service of Rear Admiral McLintock. This national Academy is proud to join those of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard in serving its country. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KINGS POINT DISCIPLINE OF SEA IN HALLS OF IVY—McLINTOCK IS PROUD OF PROGRESS IN BRIEF HISTORY—ACADEMY ON LONG ISLAND HAS 38 BUILDINGS ON 65 ACRES

(By George Horne)

KINGS POINT, LONG ISLAND.—Campus life in the pastoral acres of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy here is a rare mixture of halls of ivy and military spit and polish.

The academy—now a beautiful 65 acres with 38 buildings—is in its 21st year. It looks out over the waters where Long Island Sound meets the East River. It is one of

the five permanent national academies, along with those of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Coast Guard. And, in the opinion of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, now in his 17th year as Superintendent, not a regiment of cadets has marched over the parade ground turf of Captain Tomb Field (or up Fifth Avenue, as they often do) that could not match in discipline and bearing the best turned out by the older academies.

PRIDE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The 61-year-old admiral is proud of the fact that the school, in a relatively few years, has achieved a collegiate tradition and a military standing.

Two hundred and ten Kings Point cadets lost their lives in action in World War II. Their names are listed on a plaque and are being written in fine calligraphy in a big memorial book that is in preparation for the new Interfaith Chapel, overlooking the Sound.

The admiral is a Scot—a native of Dysart, Fifeshire—and full of his race's pawky humor. He likes to tell how an error was made in the counting and the plaque had 211 names until one day a graduate stormed in like a marlinpike skipper and demanded that his name be erased.

More than 12,000 engineer and deck officers for the merchant marine have gone out through Vickery Gate with their diplomas and licenses as seagoing officers.

Two hundred more will go out this year with these testaments and also with bachelor's degrees.

One of the McLintock goals in his early years at the institution was accreditation, which came in 1949. Another was to obtain permanent status as a national Academy, and this was granted by an act of Congress in 1959.

The admiral has been a naval reservist since 1928, but he is essentially a merchant mariner, with an affection for the sea that comes naturally to a son of a Scots family whose men were seafarers or engineers. His admiral's rank is in the U.S. maritime service.

It is a long time since seamen used a long glass, but he has a fine one. There are two round holes in the front screen door overlooking the Sound—one high enough for him, and a lower one for Mrs. McLintock—and he often stands with an eye to the glass inspecting traffic headed for the East River, or watching one of the Academy sailboats off Execution Light.

"The only trouble," he says, "is that most of the time all I can see is that what's its-name academy over in the Bronx."

This is a jibe at his friend Vice Adm. Harold C. Moore, retired Coast Guard officer, who commands the State University of New York Maritime College at Fort Schuyler.

Kings Point is one of the few colleges—and perhaps the only major one—that runs its college year through 11 months. Its plebes in their first year get the beginnings of seafaring sciences and much physical training.

In their second year they go to sea. Kings Point, unlike the State academies, does not have a schoolship for world training cruises.

"Nine hundred ships of the merchant marine are our schoolships," the admiral says.

Steamship companies are glad to get the young cadets. They are paid \$110 a month while at sea, and stand watches regularly as junior officers, either as engineers or navigators. Then they return to King's Point for 2 more years of study.

Kings Point has a teaching staff of 92 and a nonteaching staff of 172.

HALLS HAVE HISTORIES

Many of its halls were former private homes. The great classical-revival edifice that serves as the main administrative cen-

ter—Wiley Hall—was once the country mansion of Walter P. Chrysler, and Melville Hall, housing the officers' club and conference rooms was the residence of Thomas Meighan, a movie great of the silent film days. Land Hall was the estate of Nicholas Schenk.

The new Interfaith Chapel, great pillared and almost startling in the inner decor of brilliant Wedgwood blue, cost \$760,000, and was financed for the most part by public subscription. The school's next goal is a new library, and an appropriation bill has passed the committee in the House of Representatives.

Admiral McLintock cherishes the last report of the Congressional Board of Visitors, which inspects and reports on the academy each year. It gave warm approbation to the Superintendent and his staff for the quality of its curriculum and the high standing of its graduates, many of whom are now moving from sea into posts of responsibility with shipping lines and related shore industries.

Admiral McLintock served his own cadetship in the British merchant navy without benefit of a college education. He got his master's papers at the age of 22, served on the bridge of American-flag vessels, and came ashore here in 1930 to join the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. He was chief inspection officer of the Maritime Commission bureau of training for 5 years before taking over at the Academy in 1948—its fourth Superintendent.

PURPOSE: LEADERSHIP

He is no martinet, but he believes in the Academy's main purpose, turning out "leadership." He bombards the cadets with truisms and axioms from the sea.

He explains why the visibility of sea lights is usually given in miles, as seen from a height of 15 feet. In the old days, he says, this was the height of the average poop deck.

He intones an old navigating mnemonic:

"When all three lights I see ahead,
I port my helm and go to bed."

At dinner with a visitor the other day the Superintendent commented: "We may be 61 years old, but we do not look it." "Yes, you do," retorted his aide, Comdr. Robert O'Leary.

"Do you remember," Admiral McLintock asked him, what happened to the lieutenant who said 'No' to the admiral?"

"No, I do not," replied O'Leary.

"Nothing," said the admiral, "ever. He stayed a lieutenant."

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER KEPPEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 28, 1964, the U.S. Commissioner of Education spoke to the Annual Conference of the American Library Association, in St. Louis, Mo.

His speech, which touched upon a number of matters, sets forth so clearly and lucidly the problems of this segment of American education that I feel that it can be read with profit by all who share his concern. I particularly noted his comments:

Legislation to provide books, not merely bricks and mortar, is still before the Congress. It is not likely to be enacted during the remainder of this congressional session. But I believe that this legislation will again be brought before the attention of the next Congress. It is important unfinished business and it concerns us all.

This is a statement with which I am sure many Senators will agree. To vary

a metaphor used by the Commissioner, a library without books is like mortar without bricks. It is my hope that these further steps will be taken, to make our libraries fully effective. I would agree that this program, like that for the training of library personnel, ought to be kept high on our agenda of needed educational legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Commissioner Keppel's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBRARIES: FUTURE UNLIMITED

(An address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the opening session of the annual conference of the American Library Association, St. Louis, Mo., Sunday evening, June 28, 1964.)

I am delighted to be with you for your opening general session of this conference. I have been invited—indeed, I have been urged—to speak before you this evening for 45 minutes to an hour. This I could do.

But I have no intention tonight of taking advantage of librarians, who are already overwhelmed by the greatest floodtide of communications in history, a tidal wave of written and spoken words that exceeds everything written or said from the day of the Rosetta Stone to the day of movable type to the day of the portable tape recorder.

In speaking before librarians, I am aware that some of the most valued items in your stacks are not necessarily those that fill volumes or take hours of saying—that Ecclesiastes can be read in a single setting, that the Gettysburg Address can be inscribed on an envelope back, that E-MC², in overturning an era, can be said in the flicker of an eyelash.

So I plan to be reasonably brief before you who are already challenged enough by fantastic quantities of material to be selected and cataloged, retrieved, and interpreted to thousands of library users every day. Like the mosquito at the nudist colony, today's librarian may justly complain: "I see what they expect me to do. My only problem is where to begin."

In my regard for librarians, I am my father's son. He liked books. He liked libraries. He liked librarians. In his administration of the endowments of Andrew Carnegie, he saw as a principal problem of education the staffing of Carnegie's gift of libraries to America with gifted librarians, skilled in the science and art of their profession.

I consider it a happy privilege to be on hand as Commissioner when the Public Library Services and Construction Act was passed to take up where the private Carnegie benefactions left off more than 40 years ago. After years of educational famine, we have now reached a festival year of educational legislation—historic acts by the 88th Congress which include the recognition that libraries, like other aspects of American education, are becoming in larger measure our Nation's responsibility. As my father's son, I cheerfully remember his wise injunction that "Nothing succeeds like a successor."

This evening, therefore, I would like to review briefly with you some of the highlights of present and future legislation specifically applying to libraries. And then I will talk about two other developments in which libraries must, it seems to me, play a central and pivotal role.

At the outset, before we consider the problems we have, I think we might allow our-

selves a few moments of satisfaction over some of the problems we no longer have. Education and our libraries as a principal instrument of education have now moved strongly into the public's awareness.

We have repeated evidence that the rural Library Services Act has been one of the most successful and widely appreciated grant programs ever passed by the Congress. The program has clearly demonstrated how effectively Federal grants can stimulate State and local efforts for education.

This demonstration has led, in turn, to the new Library Services and Construction Act—a giant step in expanding urban public libraries and public library construction. In signing the act on February 11, President Johnson said: "There are few acts of Congress which I sign with more pleasure, and certainly none with more hope."

An act without the appropriation of funds, of course, is something of a hunting license. Last week we went on a hunting trip. I had the pleasure of testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of the President's request of \$55 million for the Library Services and Construction Act in fiscal 1965.

The new library legislation could be—and I think will be—the beginning of a renaissance in public library development. It remains for us, all of us here tonight, to help in developing State plans and programs to use these funds constructively and creatively, to assure our ultimate goal of high level public library service for all our people.

Federal seed money, to be matched by States and local communities, presents a great opportunity to remove present deficiencies in public library services. Based on past performance, I have every confidence that with local, State, and Federal collaboration, the job can be well done.

Sound statewide planning and strong, purposeful action are both important—and both are now underway. The six regional meetings last winter and spring between the staffs of our library services branch and the staffs of State library agencies led to draft regulations and procedures. The new legislation has also led to the elevation of library services in our office to divisional status.

Last week, on June 23, Secretary Celebrezze signed the final regulations under which the new act will go into effect. This week, these regulations will be officially released to the States. Meanwhile proposed plans from 34 States have already been received, indicating that the principle of building strong statewide library systems will be followed. We are presently hopeful that the 1965 appropriations will be available by August 1. With the money in the till, the real work can begin.

In addition to this specific library act, the 88th Congress also took a second major step for libraries with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act. This measure authorizes Federal matching funds for the construction of academic libraries along with classrooms and laboratories.

The inclusion of libraries was particularly gratifying to me. I have been shocked at what our statistics show us on the inadequacies of so many academic libraries, particularly at a time of rapidly growing enrollments and rapidly increasing independent study and research programs.

The library is the heart of higher education. It is just as important to the arts and the humanities as the laboratory is to the sciences. Without high quality libraries to support high quality faculties, American higher education may expand in form, but it will diminish in substance. It will be higher education in name. But it will be mediocre education in fact.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, with its help to academic library construction,

comes none too soon. Funds are provided as part of this act's authorization of \$1.2 billion over the next 3 years. But the unfinished job—the hardest job—still remains. It is to build adequate collections of books and other materials needed by college students and faculty for their study and research. This is both an immediate and a long term, continuing task. A library without books, of course, is about as useful to learning as an empty warehouse.

Legislation to provide books, not merely bricks and mortar, is still before the Congress. It is not likely to be enacted during the remainder of this congressional session. But I believe that this legislation will again be brought before the attention of the next Congress. It is important unfinished business and it concerns us all.

Basic to all library development programs, whether they be public, college, or school libraries, is the availability of well-trained personnel. The last report of our advisory committee on the library services program bore down heavily on this point. Again there is still legislation before this Congress that would authorize appropriations for training programs for librarians in addition to other educational personnel. However, if this legislation does not pass or does not provide sufficient stimulation or assistance to library training, this is another program we must keep high on the agenda for action at the earliest possible date.

So much for legislative highlights. Now let me turn to two developments in which libraries can perform a signal service to America.

The first is the national attack on poverty, a high priority program on President Johnson's list of "must" legislation. It calls on us for a range of accomplishments at home as challenging as those the Peace Corps is so nobly accomplishing abroad. It presents to us an exciting opportunity and high adventure—to conduct for the first time a successful assault on an age-old enemy, the enemy of poverty and deprivation and despair. And in this assault, the library can be an arsenal.

At every turn, the statisticians show us that poverty and ignorance are almost always linked, just as affluence and education are linked. The evidence is now incontrovertible that the ability to learn and to read goes hand in hand with the ability to earn and to succeed in our modern society. This presents a challenge not merely to public officials, or to educators generally, but to librarians specifically.

Dynamic, well-stocked, well-staffed libraries—both school and public can help develop reading interests and reading skills. They can provide not merely the books but through gifted librarians, the vital incentives that encourage and stimulate the move from illiteracy to literacy, from the wastelands of apathy to the high horizons that reading can reveal.

Today, 60 percent of America's elementary schools with 10 million of America's children have no school libraries whatsoever. This is a national disgrace. It must be eliminated. I call upon all of you, who know that a school without a library is a crippled school, to dramatize this shame of America—to carry your concern beyond your own councils to the American people.

When there are no libraries, they must be created. And where they exist, they must be dynamic if they are to serve in the coming war against poverty.

There are such libraries today. They set a goal for others to follow and amplify. They deserve our attention and the Nation's gratitude.

The Brooklyn Public Library, for example, is now conducting Operation Second Chance. Through this program, it is helping to im-

prove the reading ability of native-born and Puerto Rican functional illiterates.

The Boston Public Library has set up a tutorial service for junior and senior high school students in one area for underprivileged. The Minneapolis Public Library has provided space in a branch library in a slum area where a social worker and a librarian working together offer a broad range of service to people needing help.

In New Haven, Conn., the public library is developing a neighborhood center in a slum area, providing an educational program to attract nonreaders.

These are a few examples of libraries on the move. There are others and there will be, I predict, many more in the months and years ahead as libraries take on the responsibility—and the opportunity—that lies before them.

Our libraries, at their best, have always been creative centers of their communities. They have devised the bookmobile, one of the most dramatic and interesting extensions of what a library is all about—to bring books to the people. Today, the bookmobile offers new potentialities. It can bring books not only to rural areas, but to urban slums as well. It can attract not only readers but also small groups for remedial teaching programs.

This new momentum of creative libraries is expressed in several State plans submitted to us under the Library Services and Construction Act. They include the development of a variety of special services in culturally and economically depressed areas.

This is important and proper business for our libraries today, both under the new Library Act and also under the community action program envisioned in the President's Economic Opportunity Act—the antipoverty program. I think it is quite likely that funds for such library programs will become available. I think it is most unlikely that they will be withheld if the libraries themselves demonstrate their own creative potential for service. Indeed, the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor specifically indicates that "special library services" are contemplated under the legislation.

The second challenge to library service is equally important and moves to the other end of the scale. Just as libraries can be of indispensable service in lifting the dead weight of poverty and ignorance, so are they indispensable in meeting what is commonly and graphically called the "information explosion."

An explosion it is. From 1953 to 1963, the annual production of books has doubled. From 1961 to 1963 alone, there was a 43 percent increase. At present, the number of scientific and technical periodicals around the world is estimated as exceeding 50,000—and the number is increasing annually by 10 to 15 percent. At the present growth rate, library holdings in the year 2000 will be five times what they are today.

Meanwhile, the costs of library materials are rising in an equally alarming manner. The cost of the average library book rose 82 percent from 1948 to 1963. During the same period, the average periodical subscription rose 56 percent in cost. When we add to this the costs required for more staff to process and service the new materials, for more space to house them and the larger numbers of people who will use these facilities, it is clear that we will need to look further for funds and be infinitely resourceful in their use.

The Federal legislation passed by the 88th Congress for academic and public library construction may only provide a partial solution to this long-range problem. The encouragement of regional and cooperative resource libraries which this legislation will also foster may also ease the problem for a time.

But for big answers to the big question, more research and development will clearly be needed. I was pleased that our cooperative research program was recently able to contract with the Rutgers University Library School for the study and identification of the problems of library service in large metropolitan areas, those areas where 70 percent of our population are now living and where 85 percent will shortly be living.

One answer to the information explosion is automation—the use of the electronic computers to store and retrieve information. This of course is a promising approach. But librarians, as well as library machines, must learn to control the explosion, and they will not do so by retreating to bombproof shelters or to the archives of the past. Unless librarians maintain their position as organizers and retrievers of information, they may well wind up as a vanishing breed while another species ascends the library ladder. I have already heard this new and ominous breed called on by name. They are, I am told, "information scientists."

Library automation is now underway. At the Federal level, both the Library of Congress and the Executive Office of the President have been studying its possibilities and potentials and the National Library of Medicine of the Public Health Service has already established one of the most advanced systems in the field of medical literature.

Dr. Stafford L. Warren, a special assistant in the President's Office, recently issued a report proposing the establishment of a National Library of Science Systems and Network. What particularly interested me in Dr. Warren's report is his proposal to utilize the strengths and capabilities of existing major research libraries to prepare abstracts and citations of scientific journals in specific disciplines. These abstracts would be fed on computer tape or microfilm into a central pool in Washington from which any information in any field could be requested.

I was also impressed with Dr. Warren's specific recognition of our need in the developmental stages of the program for funds to train librarians to staff the new service. He is aware, as we are aware, that a library, above all, is a human enterprise and that it depends ultimately upon the skilled minds and talents of librarians if it is to perform its proper role in our changing society.

For libraries and librarians, this is an exciting time, a time of challenge and of opportunity. And it will remain exciting for all who are creative in this profession whose future is unlimited.

LEGISLATIVE VIEWS OF OREGON STATE GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Oregon State Grange at its annual convention adopted a number of resolutions which have been brought to my attention. Since the resolutions cover many aspects of Federal legislation currently under consideration by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks, in order that the views of these responsible representatives of Oregon agricultural interests may be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STREAM POLLUTION—COMMITTEE CONSERVATION

Whereas pollution in the Columbia River is killing large quantities of fish; and

Whereas this pollution contributes to very unsanitary conditions; and

Whereas this pollution will in a few short years destroy fish in our streams to the extent that it will be necessary to discontinue sport and commercial fishing; and

Whereas this condition by destroying spawners will eventually contribute to the eradication of ocean salmon; and

Whereas if spawners are fortunate enough to reach the spawning grounds, the pollution takes an untold toll of the fingerlings on their return to the ocean; and

Whereas the industries and municipalities that are causing these conditions should be held responsible and made to clean up their operations; and

Whereas according to recent reports this pollution is so bad that most of the commercial fishermen in the lower river are unable to use their fish nets since they collect so much slime that they cannot be handled: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Warren Grange go on record demanding that the proper State agencies take immediate action to remedy this situation and that if we do not have adequate laws to govern this, that the Oregon State Grange take steps to initiate them and a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Game Commission, Governor Hatfield, and our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Submitted by Warren Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

COLUMBIA DRAINAGE BASIN WATER—COMMITTEE RECLAMATION AND IRRIGATION

Whereas officials of Los Angeles have proposed a plan to divert Columbia Drainage Basin water to their area by pumping out of the Snake River below Thousand Springs, Idaho, and through Nevada to Lake Meade for their use in the Southwest; and

Whereas the diversion of this water would constitute a serious economic loss to the States in the Columbia River Basin where it is needed to firm up the power in the many powerplants on the Snake and Columbia Rivers below the proposed diversion; and

Whereas there are thousands of acres of desert land in Southwest Idaho that need this water for irrigation; and

Whereas the loss of this water would jeopardize navigation of the Snake and Columbia Rivers from Lewiston to the sea; and

Whereas it could seriously affect the salmon and steelhead runs in these streams which have been increasing the past several years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Grange go on record opposing any action by anyone attempting to transport water outside the confines of the Columbia Drainage Basin; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge action by Congress to prevent the diversion of these waters by outside interests; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE and Representative AL ULLMAN.

Submitted by Jefferson Pomona Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—COMMITTEE LEGISLATION

Whereas the country is going farther and farther into debt, and the budget is getting farther and farther out of balance; and

Whereas the good President has signed into law a tax reduction with an implied promise to cut down on spending: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Central Grange, Clackamas County, hereby go on record as strenuously opposed to a pay raise of Members of Congress and other Government officials as recently reported out by the rules committee,

a pay raise of from 28 to 44 percent when any raise above 3 percent is supposed to be inflationary; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Grange Legislative Committee, MAURINE NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE.

Submitted by Central Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

DUNES SEASHORE PARK—COMMITTEE CONSERVATION

Whereas the United States and Congress are being asked to establish a dunes national seashore park of some 30,000 acres on the Oregon coast which will include rights of condemnation of private property; and

Whereas the State government and Federal agencies have numerous parks, wayside areas, campsites and recreational areas on the Oregon coast: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Jasper Grange meeting in regular session this 10th day of December 1963, go on record commending Senator MORSE for his attempt to amend this seashore park bill to forbid condemnation of private property; and be it further

Resolved, That Jasper Grange go on record opposing the creation of any national park in the dunes area of the Oregon coast. This resolution to be sent to Senator MORSE of Oregon with copies to Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, and to MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate democratic leader.

Submitted by Lane Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oregon State Grange.

AID TO INJURED PERSONS—COMMITTEE LEGISLATION

Whereas on many occasions a person desires to help those who are in positions of peril, or have been injured or are in pain and need immediate aid; and

Whereas those wishing to come to their aid are reluctant to do so because of the possibility, and in many cases probability, that they may be subject to civil or criminal liability or harassment or nuisance, or be compelled to defend a court action because they have helped those in need of immediate aid or treatment; and

Whereas many physicians and/or surgeons, some licensed to practice in the State of Oregon and some unlicensed but otherwise qualified, registered nurses, ambulance drivers, and some ambulance attendants, and those having duly recognized first-aid certificates with to help others; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of all the people that those answering in good faith they cry, or need for help in emergency situations, are entitled to the protection of law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the United States be encouraged to enact "good Samaritan" legislation which will release from civil or criminal liability those persons to wit: Duly qualified physicians and surgeons, registered nurses, ambulance drivers, ambulance attendants, those having a duly recognized first-aid certificate of competency, and other persons acting in good faith and for the best interests of those in positions of danger, or being injured, and using that standard of conduct that a prudent man in a like position and competency, would do in a similar situation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the National Grange and to the Congress of the United States for their action.

Submitted by Pacific Grange.

Adopted by Clatsop Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oregon State Grange.

OPPOSE H.R. 3669 AND S. 774—COMMITTEE LEGISLATION

Whereas the present existing law is sufficient to protect both the manufacturer and the consumer;

Whereas under our free enterprise system competition is the life blood of our economy; and

Whereas there needs to be flexibility under varying conditions; and

Whereas this bill would work hardship on the average consumer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Parkdale Grange go on record as being opposed to H.R. 3669 and S. 774, to amend the antitrust laws to authorize manufacturers to fix resale prices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Representative AL ULLMAN, Representative WALTER NORBLAD, and to the National Grange.

Submitted by Parkdale Grange.

Adopted by the Oregon State Grange.

THIS BOOMING ECONOMY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first page of the Monthly Economic Letter of July from the First National City Bank of New York entitled "General Business Conditions" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL BUSINESS CONDITIONS

At midyear, business activity continues to push ahead on a broad front. Consumer demand is strong and businessmen have further confirmed plans to increase spending for plants and equipment. Against this background of high-level business activity, there are some uncertainties, but nothing that should halt the uptrend during 1964. Defense cutbacks are causing business letdowns in certain localities and construction seems to be leveling off at record highs. Questions are being raised about the outcome of labor negotiations this summer in the auto industry and the pattern it might set for labor contracts in other areas. And abroad there is the nagging problem of inflation, which is being fought not only with fiscal and "incomes policies" but also with monetary restraint, including higher interest rates.

In the months immediately ahead we will experience the usual letdown that accompanies vacations and hot weather. But the strength of demand indicates that the seasonal dip in steel production and other manufacturing activities may be shallower than usual this year. Thus, after seasonal adjustment, business activity will continue rising.

The gross national product is unofficially estimated to have reached an annual rate of approximately \$620 billion in the second quarter, compared with a \$608 billion rate in the first quarter and \$600 billion in the final 3 months of 1963. The increase would be comparable in size to the fourth quarter rise last year. The influence of the tax cut is not only evident in increasing consumer demand, but also—as was hoped for—in accelerating capital investment.

The industrial production index advanced in May to a new record of 130.3 (seasonally adjusted, 1957-59=100). The index has risen about 5 percent in the past year, with half of the rise concentrated in the last 4 months.

SPENDING THE TAX-CUT DOLLARS

There is little doubt any more that consumers are spending more freely. Retail sales in the first quarter averaged 4.4 percent more than a year earlier, but in April the year-to-year gain widened to 5.5 percent and in May it reached 7.4 percent.

The market for new cars has been exceptionally good. In the month ended June 20, dealers reported the daily rate of new

car sales was up 7 percent from the previous peak performance in 1963 and 8 percent from the 1955 period. In the first half of 1964, over 4 million domestic cars are estimated to have been sold—up 7 percent from 1963. To achieve the goal of an 8-million car year (including around 400,000 imported cars) domestic car sales would need only to match the 1963 pace in the second half of the year.

SPACE PROGRAM IS HERE TO STAY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Kansas City Star an editorial entitled "Space Program Is Here To Stay." It points out that President Johnson has reaffirmed the national space goals set by President Kennedy when he said:

I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed every night by the light of a Communist moon.

Expressing surprise that some would disagree with this, the editorial sets out five reasons, given by the Administrator of NASA, James E. Webb, for the space program. These are:

- (1) National security.
- (2) International leadership in science and technology.
- (3) Acquisition of scientific knowledge and technical skills.
- (4) Practical uses of space for the benefit of mankind.
- (5) The challenge of space exploration.

Speaking of the need for our space program, the Kansas City Star says:

A more effective argument than defense—for the present at least—deals with this Nation's world leadership. A successful landing on the moon—and a return—would provide a demonstration of scientific competence. It would, we believe, impress on the rest of the world the fact of this Nation's position as the leader in science.

With that most of us will agree. If our Nation is to remain strong and a leader of men, then it is necessary that we maintain a position of leadership in the greatest adventure of our time.

Not only would a slowdown in this program have an adverse effect on U.S. leadership, but it would cost the taxpayer more money. NASA estimates that for every year the program is stretched out a billion dollars would have to be added to the program. That is not surprising. Any major R. & D. program requires a tight timetable if it is to be an efficient program and provide the necessary incentive. Without a tight timetable the work drags on through repeated changes and indecision. As in most human endeavors the establishment of a tight schedule in fact provides assurance that the program will in fact be accomplished.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Kansas City Star of June 14, 1964, entitled "Space Program Is Here To Stay," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, June 14, 1964]

SPACE PROGRAM IS HERE TO STAY

"If the whole objective were to bring back a handful of lunar sand, or hang a sign, 'Kill-

roy was here," none in NASA would pursue it. Space is a proper subject for man. I do not believe any other material program has so captured the imagination of the whole world."—Dr. WERNER VON BRAUN.

Von Braun, as an eminent spaceman, is not exactly an unbiased observer. Nevertheless, we suspect that his sentiment on behalf of the \$20 billion effort to place Americans on the moon in this decade reflects the views of most scientists and of a sizable segment of the public.

The lunar landing venture, in 3 years, has become a vital part of the Nation's political, social, and economic fabric. Every time you pay \$1 to the Federal Government in income taxes, about 5 cents is marked for space. Naturally, so expensive a program is a source of political controversy. Continuous debate is in order. On the other hand, we regard a stated national goal as a fact of history. There was wide acceptance in 1961 when President Kennedy declared a moon landing in this decade to be a national goal.

In part, it was an attempt to buoy the Nation's spirits in the face of Soviet successes. But without similar prodding, President Johnson has reaffirmed the policy:

"I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed each night by the light of a Communist moon."

We are not surprised that some citizens disagree. For example, the Republican Critical Issues Council recently questioned the program. But it was critical not of the space endeavor itself, but significantly, of the timing. It urged the administration to drop the 1970 deadline.

Such criticism is understandable and it has a purpose. On the other hand, we note also that a Republican task force has expressed doubt about the two-man Gemini capsule for its lack of a tower rescue system. That strikes us as a matter of scientists, not for politicians. Really, now, we doubt that there is a Republican or a Democratic way to build a spaceship.

Nearly 7 years after Sputnik I, it is significant that few voices have been raised of late to demand the abandonment of the space venture. So far, the proposed \$5.2 billion appropriation for the next fiscal year has met little opposition on Capitol Hill. Of course it has barely left the launching pad of one House committee and we would expect some reduction. At any rate, it is timely to review the progress of the space program and to examine its justification today.

In the vast industrial plants across the Nation, where the boosters and spacecraft are being assembled, the United States clearly is nearing the halfway point in the great moon adventure. The tools and dies have been made. The hardware is being built. Ground facilities for assembly and testing are being completed.

The investment already has reached \$7 billion. By June 30, 1965, \$10 billion will have been committed. These are funds for the round trip to the moon. Civilian space expenditures of all types may reach \$35 billion by 1970.

Despite frustrating delays on subordinate parts of the mission, the major components are on schedule. Saturn IB, designed to put the Apollo spacecraft in earth orbit, is scheduled to soar in 1966. Saturn V, the moon rocket, will be tested in space in 1967.

The pessimism that prevailed 6 months ago has been replaced by a buoyant optimism on the part of space agency and industrial officials. In these circles no one can be found who doubts that this country now has the means to achieve a lunar landing and possibly on schedule.

But then why go to the moon at all? Is the trip worth \$20 billion? The most articulate defender, James E. Webb, space agency Administrator, suggests five reasons:

National security.

International leadership in science and technology.

Acquisition of scientific knowledge and technical skills.

Practical uses of space for the benefit of mankind.

The challenge of space exploration.

Some of these arguments are stronger than others and it is doubtful whether the moon flight could be justified by any one of them. Taken collectively, however, the case seems to be strong indeed.

The defense argument becomes less tenable as more is learned about space. Orbiting nuclear weapons have been pretty well ruled out by the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to keep them out of space. The practical reason is that earthbound missiles would be infinitely more accurate.

Presumably the chief military use of space vehicles will be for surveillance. The U.S. Samos project—designed to put picture-taking satellites in orbit—is hush-hush. Nikita Khrushchev seems to be the only one will discuss this type of space effort. He says he has pictures taken from space. At any rate, space spying has not yet become an open and important part of the defense scheme. Possibly it will. But this type of activity hardly compares with the usual fanciful pictures of space warfare we used to get a few years ago.

A more effective argument than defense—for the present at least—deals with this Nation's world leadership. A successful landing on the moon—and a return—would provide a demonstration of scientific competence. It would, we believe, impress on the rest of the world the fact of this Nation's position as the leader in science.

The practical benefits from space will come first from projects incidental to the moon landing. These include weather and navigation satellites and communications. The spinoff commercial benefits make an imposing list. But let's not get too hasty in counting their value. We have seen pans made from heat-shield materials and the astronaut program has introduced some new medical concepts. Nevertheless, it will be some time before space has significantly changed the lot of man on earth. The day will come, however.

There is another strong argument in the challenge of space exploration to the spirit of man. Once Yuri Gagarin demonstrated that man could fly freely through space, the exploration of the moon, Mars, and other planets became inevitable. Human nature cannot resist the challenge, and frankly, we would have it no other way.

In connection with the moon program, a very practical reason for its continuance is that we are halfway there. A few more appropriation bills in the next 3 or 4 years will complete the major financing.

Current attacks have been centered more on the "crash" nature of the program. There is an impression that a slower pace could save money. We fail to understand the reasoning. Visit the space plants and you see no evidence of a speedup. George E. Mueller, Deputy Administrator, contends that to delay the moon landing 3 years would add \$2.6 billion to the cost. It is a point that congressional committees ought to check out.

Some critics suggest that we may, by now, be merely racing ourselves to the moon. There has been some confusion over Kremlin pronouncements but confusion has always been a fine Communist weapon. The Soviet program is secret but the open evidence suggests that the Reds would be very happy to land a man on the moon first—if they can. It would be risky to assume that the Soviet Union has abandoned its once-stated purpose in space.

The economic effects of the space program are causing increasing discussion and con-

cern. Present employment of 250,000 for all civilian contractors and subcontractors is expected to level off at 300,000 next year. A letup may follow. For all practical purposes the industrial phase of the moon project is now simply an assembly operation. Some manufacturers are beginning to cast anxious eyes to the future. They may have developed more rocket and spacecraft capabilities than NASA knows how to use.

This has led to many conferences between Government and participating companies on what will come after the lunar landing. Huge orbiting space stations, more moon landings, and probes to Mars have been proposed. We would assume that even before that first landing on the moon, some additional decisions will have to be made.

For the present, however, there is the fact that the huge space industry complex—and the space psychology itself—has found a place in the Nation's consciousness. The United States is more than 6 years away from its first puny satellite, and in that time the acceleration of progress has been on the edge of the fantastic. The space age has barely been born but we cannot see how anyone can misread the promise of adventure and discovery in the years to come.

WHAT NEXT FROM PUGWASH?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Security Council has published in the July 6, 1964, Washington Report one of the best and most revealing articles which the American Security Council has ever produced. This article is entitled, "What Next From Pugwash?" and was written by a Korean war hero who has established himself as an authority on U.S. disarmament efforts. In this article, Mr. Duane Thorin has written an excellent analysis of the Pugwash Conferences originally established by Mr. Khrushchev's close friend and confidant, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, who favors laying down U.S. arms in the face of the threats posed to the world by the forces of world communism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Thorin's report on the Pugwash Conferences.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT NEXT FROM PUGWASH?

The full portent of the Pugwash Conferences has never been grasped by the American public. Yet these friendly meetings between Communist and free world scientists and other "thought leaders," the first of which was held 7 years ago today, have become the incubator for U.S. foreign policy in its headlong plunge toward world government under the banner of "disarmament."

To date, there have been 12 of these "Conferences on Science and World Affairs," with the 13th scheduled for September in Carlsbad, Czechoslovakia. From their very beginning they have had the enthusiastic support of Soviet Dictator Khrushchev and have been attended by Soviet representatives. Starting with the seventh and eighth meetings, they have also enjoyed the blessing of the U.S. Chief of State. Despite the fact that the Soviets had only recently shattered the test ban moratorium, President Kennedy sent a message to the September 1961 conclave at Stowe, Vt., stating that he looked to the Pugwash movement for "initiative and guidance."

Even before this, however, the late President had given his tacit approval to Pugwash. Soon after his election in 1960 Walt

W. Rostow and Jerome Wiesner, whom he later selected for top-level policy posts in his administration, were active participants in the Sixth Pugwash Conference in Moscow. More recently, President Johnson has picked up the torch. In January he sent the following message to the 12th meeting convened in India:

"I have followed the proceedings of your earlier conferences. They are a serious attempt to achieve new solutions to old problems. I look forward to new ideas in this field. In your last meeting, a suggestion was made to exchange officers between the military establishments in certain areas of Europe. Let me assure you that this suggestion, as well as any other new ideas, will be studied thoroughly by me and by this Government in our continued effort to achieve workable disarmament."

Exactly what are these conferences upon which the President relies so heavily for "new ideas"? They take their name from Pugwash, Nova Scotia, where Nikita Khrushchev's close friend, Cleveland industrialist, Cyrus Eaton, played host to the first meeting at his summer home from July 6-11, 1957. The invitations were issued by Lord Bertrand Russell, patriarch of the peace movement and the philosophical father of the Pugwash movement. Among the most ardent backers have been Dr. Linus Pauling, America's leading "peace" pusher, and the late Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Communist who was dismissed as his country's atomic energy commissioner for proclaiming that "progressive" scientists could not in conscience work on weapons that could be used against the Soviet Union.

The purpose of the Pugwash powwows, as described by Prof. Eugene Rabinowitch, founder and editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, has been to "breach the walls of isolation" and wash away the "atmosphere of suspicion in which scientists and science have become enveloped since the days of (Alan Nunn) May and (Klaus) Fuchs."

As Senator THOMAS J. DODD has said, the free world scientist comes to Pugwash "with an open mind, full of trust, and a desire to communicate and cooperate. The Communist scientist comes . . . with carefully defined political directives. It is his duty to attempt to shape and exploit the conferences in a manner which will best serve the ends of Soviet imperialism." The leading Soviet Pugwash delegate, until his death in 1962, was A. V. Topchiev, a power in the Communist-controlled Soviet Academy of Sciences, and chief hatchetman in the purges of nonconformist Russian scientists under both Stalin and Khrushchev.

In short, the American and other Western conferees are playing policy poker at Pugwash with a loaded deck. And the stakes are nothing less than the security and freedom of the United States and its allies. How then has the game been going? The seventh anniversary of Pugwash seems an appropriate time to tote up the score:

(1) The U.S. "program for general and complete disarmament" conforms in its basic design and significant details to a plan previously outlined in the first six Pugwash Conferences.

(2) Unilateral disarmament before United States-Soviet ratification of the formal program has always been near and dear to the heart of many leading Pugwashers. They argue that America must make the first concrete moves toward disarmament if we wish the Soviet to take our official proposals seriously. (How far the United States has gone down this unilateral road was outlined last week in the June 20 issue of Washington Report.)

(3) The "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin was pushed by Pug-

wash ostensibly as a means of avoiding an "accidental" nuclear war but also to set up direct communications between the U.S. Chief Executive and the Soviet "head of state."

(4) The nuclear test ban treaty of July 1963 was actively sought by Pugwashers as far back as 1960. They billed it as a "confidence building" measure and a "first step which would open the way to the steps beyond." Their words were echoed almost verbatim by the administration in winning Senate ratification of the Treaty of Moscow 3 years later.

(5) Several Pugwash-prescribed "steps beyond" the test ban have already been taken. Perhaps the most important is the United States-Soviet agreement to ban the orbiting of nuclear weapons—with no provision to inspect or enforce Soviet compliance. Moreover, this agreement was effected through the United Nations and approved by the U.S. executive branch, thus bypassing the U.S. Senate and the treaty-making procedures set forth in the Constitution.

It is revealing to follow the sequence of events leading up to this last agreement. In late September of last year the 11th Pugwash Conference convened in Yugoslavia. The conferees hailed the Treaty of Moscow and urged a "ban on orbiting nuclear weapons" as "another recommended step which would have the effect of increasing international confidence." The Pugwashers specifically recommended that this step be taken as a "declaration by the heads of state of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations."

Three weeks later, on October 16 and 17, the pertinent U.N. resolution was drafted and approved by acclamation. Ambassadors Stevenson of the United States and Federenko of the U.S.S.R. had already given prior endorsement to the draft. Stevenson declared that "the United States has no intention" of placing nuclear weapons in orbit or on space platforms—but no similar explicit declaration was made by the Soviet's Federenko.

From these and other recent events the relationship between Pugwash proposals and U.S. policies is demonstrably clear. The question is to what ultimate end will this relationship lead? Surprisingly, even some Pugwashers seem a bit uncertain about what kind of offspring the marriage may produce. At the eighth conference in 1961 two American Pugwashers—Harrison Brown and Aaron Katz—posed the following questions:

"How will a world without armaments function? How will international disputes be resolved? Will a World Court resolve disputes? If so, how will the laws governing the Court be made. Will the laws apply to nations alone, or will they also apply to individuals? What will be the nature of the international security forces? How will they operate? Who will direct them?"

Other Pugwashers have endeavored to supply the answers. Walt W. Rostow, speaking from his lofty perch as the U.S. State Department's top planning officer, confidently proclaims that the disarmed world will function under "strict international controls." As for the jurisdiction of the World Court, several other American Pugwashers have urged that the Court be empowered to try any individual for "crimes against the peace." Such "crimes" might include even vocal opposition to a disarmament treaty or the international control organization. One conferee even proposes the death sentence in absentia for any individual who fails to appear before the Court when summoned. Such a sentence would make this individual an international outlaw and any peace-loving citizen might kill him with impunity—and possibly for reward.

These are but a few samplings of the "new solutions to old problems." One hopes that the President will take a closer and more

careful look at Pugwash before he decides to implement any further ideas generated by these conferences. A few more steps beyond and he may well find himself presiding over the affairs of a nation that has lost its sovereignty and been trapped into de facto surrender.

DUANE THORIN,
Guest Editor.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, all of us are generally familiar with and proud of the fine humanitarian work that has been accomplished by Project Hope.

So far the hospital ship *Hope* has logged 22,000 miles, which is the equivalent of a trip around the globe.

Thousands of patients have been treated and many doctors and nurses have been trained in modern medical techniques by the American doctor and nurse volunteers.

A recent issue of the New Haven Register carried an article about some Connecticut doctors and nurses who have participated in Project Hope, treating the less fortunate and teaching their foreign counterparts in Vietnam, Indonesia, Peru, and Ecuador.

I think it is admirable of Dr. Donald P. Shedd, Registered Nurse Nancy Campion and the other doctors and nurses to take time out from their careers to help fulfill the moral obligation we Americans have to try to improve the everyday lives of people in the less prosperous countries.

By way of tribute to the Connecticut and other volunteers who have helped to make such a success of Project Hope, I ask unanimous consent to have the New Haven Register article, "Project Hope Nurse," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAVES OF LAUREL—PROJECT HOPE NURSE
(By Marc Drogin)

"To a doctor it is a shocking experience to find oneself plunked down abruptly among so much human suffering. Finding oneself providing medical care to people who otherwise might not receive it, has a strong emotional impact.

"This is an impact," Dr. Donald P. Shedd explained, "which is difficult to describe but probably is related to the sense of obligation one man has for another—an obligation which has been clearly spelled out in my religion and in others."

One way in which Americans are paying this moral obligation is through a most basic level—health—in the form of a project taking place today on the world's first peacetime hospital ship in the Guayas River at the harbor of Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Dr. Shedd, acting chairman of the local committee for Project Hope and member of the Yale School of Medicine faculty, Grace-New Haven Hospital, has had firsthand experience at the work and wonder of such a project, and an opportunity to work with and know a Waterbury nurse who stands out as someone particularly special among the more than 500 American physicians, dentists, nurses, and auxiliary personnel who have volunteered their efforts in Project Hope over the past 4 years.

"Hope is essentially a teaching program," Dr. Shedd explained, "although necessarily there is treatment involved. American staff members work with their counterparts in

foreign countries, can pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions. Ann Theresa Campion is an outstanding example of the type of dedicated individual who is willing to give several years of service to this project in international medicine."

One of six nurses who has served on the ship for all three of its medical education missions, Miss Campion is a graduate of St. Mary's Hospital School of Nursing, Waterbury, and of Hunter College in New York, with 9 years' experience in Veterans' Administration hospital work.

She wrote to Hope in 1959 when she learned that the Government had agreed to take a hospital ship out of mothballs and loan it to the nonprofit foundation for a floating medical university that would visit countries less privileged than ours.

She spent 10 months with the *Hope* in South Vietnam and Indonesia, training local nurses and administering gentle, competent care to those who, without the *Hope*, would never have had an opportunity for better health, or a belief that strangers, Americans, cared enough to help them.

After a homeward trip for supplies, the *Hope* sailed in May 1962 for Peru, with Miss Campion again aboard, as Dr. Shedd recalls, "spreading cheer and happiness in her own inimitable way. When not on active duty, she was frequently surrounded by admiring young patients who, even though they could not speak her language, found communication easy with her warm and loving personality."

Again in 1963 she volunteered to remain aboard the *Hope* and it sailed in November—now training hundreds of doctors, nurses, auxiliary medical personnel in Guayaquil, Quito, and Cuenca, and Duran. Supported by contributions always welcome at Project Hope (1261 Avenue of the Americas, room 2858, New York, N.Y.) the *Hope* has so far logged 22,000 miles, the equivalent of once around the globe.

Dr. Shedd indicated other local people who have helped with this project: Miss Barbara Rousseau at West Haven Veterans' Administration Hospital; Miss Elizabeth Berry, of New Britain; Miss Catherine Murphy, of Bridgeport; Miss Dorothy Grimes, of Wolcott; Dr. Paul W. Tischer, of New Britain; Dr. Allen Margold, of Norwalk; Dr. Chester Weed, of Hartford; Miss Priscilla Strong, who came from Grace-New Haven Hospital; and Dr. Archie Golden, of New Milford.

People like these, and like Miss Campion help to pay a moral obligation of which we perhaps should be aware in realizing that this world is filled with many less fortunate. And the work that people like these can do, makes its impact felt.

"There is another strong impact," Dr. Shedd concluded, "and it is an important one. One feels an intense pride in the dedicated group with which he is working."

"This is a group of fellow countrymen who make you feel that perhaps North Americans are not all ugly Americans."

THE RACIAL SITUATION IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Danbury News-Times carried a series of three exceptional articles on the difficult and tense racial situation in St. Augustine, Fla.

The articles were prepared by Jonathan Brown, the 19-year-old son of Eugene J. Brown, the publisher of the News-Times, who spent 3 weeks participating in the integrationist movement in St. Augustine.

Because each of the three is so well written and such a graphic description of the efforts to integrate this historic city I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danbury News-Times, June 29, 1964]

THE ST. AUGUSTINE STORY: A CITY RULED BY FEAR

(By Jonathan Brown)

(This is the first of a series of articles by Jonathan Brown, 19, of 80 Clapboard Ridge Road, on the current situation in St. Augustine, Fla. Brown has returned from that city after 3 weeks participation in the integrationist movement there. His assignment was to set up a tutorial school for Negro students and to lay the groundwork for a daily news-sheet covering the movements of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Brown is a graduate of Kent School and is entering his junior year at Yale.)

For a "white," working in civil rights in the South is a strange mixture of love and fear.

As soon as the white integrationist demonstrates his involvement in the freedom movement, he is adopted by the Negro community.

Because I was beaten up by Klansmen and local police twice during the first 2 days of my stay in St. Augustine, all doors in the Negro community were immediately open for "the boy who had come down from the North to help."

At the same time, the segregationists put the white integrationist in a special category of hatred for in their eyes he is a "traitor to the white race."

OUTSIDE AGITATOR

To the segregationists I was "an outside agitator," a "white nigger," and quite obviously a sexual pervert.

To the average northern white who seems naturally to stay within the environment of his own race and to whom the Negro community remains much of an enigma, his stay in the South is a juxtaposition.

Suddenly, in the South, the Negro community becomes his physical and spiritual home not only because he is involved in the freedom struggle, but because the white community becomes alien and dangerous.

ONE HOME OPEN

During my entire 3-week stay in St. Augustine, I visited only one white home, that of a divorcee with six children ranging in age from 3 to 24—Mrs. Margaret Ann Muhl.

The only local white resident who dared to demonstrate with us, because of her basic belief in equality, Mrs. Muhl had been almost totally ostracized by white St. Augustine.

She received as many as 35 threatening phone calls a day, found a wiretap on her phone. After she and one of her sons marched with Negroes in a nonviolent demonstration a gang of kids outside her home just waited for any of her children to appear.

Mrs. Muhl believes that virtually all the white people of St. Augustine are for segregation (the mayor proudly admits he is one) and attributes this to "generations of hatred, misunderstanding, and a basic belief in their own supremacy."

They have, she says, "an abysmal disregard for equality under our Constitution."

WHITE NIGGERS

Mrs. Muhl and the other whites from outside St. Augustine are called "white niggers," and in effect when a white person joins the integration fight, he gives up all the rights

and privileges that a white person has in the South.

A walk through the white sections of St. Augustine will very likely result if you are recognized in a beating or at the least, verbal harassment.

In contrast, a walk through the Negro community is one of the friendly hellos or chats with people you know and don't know.

Home and safety is black, alienation and injury is white.

Northern whites comes to the South to fight for civil rights for many reasons.

The older ones come mainly for religious reasons or because they have been in the movement so long that freedom has become something for which they continually fight.

The religious integrationist has a firm commitment to fight for equal rights based on religious principles.

From Genesis to modern theology, they see religion demanding them to make all men free.

UNCOMMON BRAVERY

Mostly ministers, these people of faith have shown uncommon bravery in the face of constant physical assaults.

Sarah Patton Boyle, of Virginia, author of "The Desegregated Heart" and other books on civil rights, entered the movement in her native State and seems to turn up whenever the movement needs help.

The younger white integrationists come to the South for generally different reasons.

Most of them do not seem to have the firm religious commitment, rather basing their involvement on natural not supernatural principles.

STARTED ACTING

As one college student remarked, "I have been in school for years and have been learning over and over again what is right and what is wrong. It's time I started acting."

For others, the civil rights movement does not involve just the Negro, but in fact all men of good faith.

One rabbi remarked that "anytime one man's liberty is infringed upon, then the liberty of all men is infringed upon."

"As long as I cannot take a friend into a restaurant or motel or any other public place simply because his skin is not white, then his freedom as well as mine has been violated."

In my own case, I came to St. Augustine to set up a tutorial program for Negro children to be run by northern college students and to start a newspaper for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Martin Luther King's organization, which is leading the integration fight in St. Augustine.

I was needed, I thought I could be useful, and I went.

However, after a few days, I began to feel that I was not in St. Augustine just to help the Negroes in education or gaining admittance to public facilities or to convince the local whites that all men were created equal by God and the Constitution.

NADIR OF MANKIND

It became clear to me (as it does to others) that I was fighting for my country, black and white, just as surely as if I had enlisted in the armed services.

Segregation based on violence and ignorance is making this country as totalitarian and backward as Nazi Germany or any other example of the nadir of mankind.

While the segregationists validly point to the existence of discrimination in the North, the white integrationist should not necessarily feel he has to stay home and help there.

The white integrationist is vitally important in the South not because of his know-how or education but because his very

presence shows that the civil rights struggle is not drawn along strictly racial boundaries.

He says to the Nation and to the world (rightfully horrified that a nation which is so proud of its democratic way of life should tolerate segregation) that this is more than a problem of skin pigmentation.

In reality it arises out of the self-interest and ignorance which one group of people has decided should be the determination of their way of life.

Segregation is only one of the techniques of the man who says, "I am the best and I should be treated as such because everything I do and think is right and good."

The white integrationist in the South places the "Negro problem" where it should be, in the realm of the struggle between the man who sees himself as the world against he who sees himself in the world.

Segregation is a moral problem for all of us.

[From the Danbury News-Times, June 30, 1964]

ECONOMIC CHAOS: THE TWO ST. AUGUSTINES—TOURISM AND BRUTALITY

(By Jonathan Brown)

(This is the second in a series of articles on St. Augustine by Jonathan Brown, of Danbury.)

DANBURY.—St. Augustine, the oldest city in North America, has long prided itself as the birthplace of American civilization.

But after 399 years, this northeast Florida city of 15,500 is the Birmingham of Florida—a symbol for racial strife.

I have been to St. Augustine half a dozen times, first as a tourist, just recently as an integrationist.

I have found that there are two St. Augustines.

The first is a tourist attraction with a beautifully preserved Spanish fortress, the oldest house on the continent turned into a museum, and the usual lesser historical attractions trying to get their share of tourist dollars.

LIKE ANY OTHER

The other St. Augustine is like any town one would find in north Florida, Alabama, or Mississippi. Segregation is a social basis of the city and the vast majority of whites who control the power structure will commit any excess to protect the supremacy of the white race.

Like most of the other segregation towns, St. Augustine is controlled by the Ku Klux Klan.

When I went to St. Augustine, I expected violence from Klansmen and it happened. What surprised me, however, was the conspiracy between local, county, and State police and the Klan elements.

There are some 250 State police in St. Augustine today. Last Friday, sitting on the porch of the Negro home in which I was staying, a dozen police cars passed within 15 minutes.

On the eve of its 400th anniversary celebration in 1965, St. Augustine is a town of violence and fear.

Each day new demonstrations are held by Negroes seeking their rights by sitting in at restaurants, marching downtown, and attempting to use a white beach which by law is integrated, and by the violence of the Klan segregated.

And each day one sees nonviolent demonstrators being beaten by white hoodlums and Klansmen regardless of the fact that these integrationists may be ministers of God, a 70-year-old woman, or just young children.

SKIN NOT WHITE

Except for two dime stores' lunch counters and a Howard Johnson's restaurant, St. Augustine is segregated for 3,500 of its citizens simply because their skin is not white.

Each side is determined that it shall win the current fight and has brought in help from outside St. Augustine.

The groups of integrationists from Savannah, Ga., Albany, Ga., Boston, Mass., Williamston, N.C., and other places, are for the most part gone now, but 1,000 Klansmen from other parts of the South remain.

The Klan is the backbone of the segregation movement and as one of its speakers, Rev. Connie Lee, of Alabama, has said, "I believe in violence, all the violence it takes to either scare the Niggers out of the country or to have them all 6 feet under."

In contrast, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference under its leader, Martin Luther King (the Klan refers to him as Martin Looney Coon), which is heading the St. Augustine civil rights movement, preaches nonviolence.

Like every other "freedom fighter," I was given training in nonviolence, how to fall to the ground and "cover up the vital parts of your body because one must not fight back."

I was told that when I saw another integrationist being beaten up I could not attack his assailant under any case. The only thing I could do would be to throw my own body over my friend's to protect him.

DESTROYING ITSELF

Almost unrecognized amidst the violence and hatred in St. Augustine is the fact that a city is destroying itself, physically and spiritually and economically.

Because the civil rights movement had adopted nonviolence as its method and Christianity as its creed, the integrationists constantly suffer physical injury.

Their homes and cars are shot into, they are fired from their jobs simply because they dare to demonstrate for their rights, and they are hurt during demonstrations because police will not protect them.

While the majority of the Negroes believe in this nonviolence, some do not, and during the early morning hours, whites and Negroes attack each other.

Because city and county officials and police are openly sympathetic with the segregationists, the responsible white citizens of St. Augustine have lost their will to change their town, abrogating their responsibility to what they themselves call "the town's scum."

As one white youth put it, the responsible whites in St. Augustine are afraid of the violence of the Klan and apathetic because they do not think they can do anything to stop the Klan. They just sit home and watch TV.

Thus far, the few local white businessmen who have integrated their establishments have been forced to segregate them again after Klan elements broke their windows and made personal threats against the men and their families.

BODY DESTROYED

As the soul of the city is being destroyed, so is its body. The economy of St. Augustine is 85 percent dependent on tourism and the city had hoped to attract 2.5 million visitors and \$25 million during the year-long 400th anniversary of the founding of St. Augustine next year.

But the racial strife has had a disastrous effect on tourism. Tourists are frightened by the newspaper articles and television films of the war in St. Augustine.

If a man's conscience will not keep him away, the threat to his physical safety will.

Tourist figures are down from 30 to 50 percent over the same months of last year according to reports of 2 weeks ago. The extreme violence of last week and the presence of 1,000 Klansmen should decrease these figures even more.

Prospects appear dim that St. Augustine can have a successful and profitable quadricentennial celebration if the present conflict is not quickly resolved.

[From the Danbury News-Times, July 1, 1964]

HOW A POLICEMAN WATCHES AS A BOY IS KICKED, BEATEN

(By Jonathan Brown)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of a series of three articles written by Jonathan Brown, 19, of Danbury, covering his experiences in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., during the recent demonstrations and riots in the confrontation between civil rights groups and opposing groups.)

A Yale classmate and I arrived in St. Augustine on the morning of June 9. That night we marched through the white section of the town to protest the continuing violence against the civil rights marchers and the injustice of segregation.

By marching in the usual nonviolent manner and taking the blows without returning the violence we hoped to stir the conscience of the town and Nation—but especially we hoped, by our example, to arouse the conscience of the attackers.

BEGIN TO FORM

Early in the evening the nonviolent marchers begin to form—two by two. I am scared because I am white and will be a special target of the Klan's violence who look upon us as "white niggers" deserving the worst. I feel guilty for my skin—I know that many of us are going to be hurt by fellow whites.

I realize that the only quality I have in common with white segregationists and Klansmen is the color of our skins.

The procession moves out from the church where it started and quickly reaches the old slave market, a block park with various enclosures where slaves once were sold.

Led by two Southern Christian Leadership Conference men, Rev. Andrew Young and Rev. Lavert Taylor, we attempt to cross the street into the slave market.

A score of white youths ranging in age from 20 to 25 block our way and when we refuse to stop, the two integration leaders are attacked and hit time and again by the whites.

Further back in the line we see this. Young punks beating up ministers while local and county police stand not 10 yards away refusing to interfere.

PULLS BACK

The line pulls back and Young and Taylor try to cross at another intersection. Again they are beaten, fall to the ground and are kicked. Young is hit by a blackjack.

This time, however, the area is brightened by the floodlights of newsmen and the young hoodlums get scared and retreat into the enclosure of the slave market.

The line moves around the slave market from which the whites yell taunts and obscenities.

Suddenly, 10 yards in front of me, five white segregationists attack the first white in our line, Rev. Bill England of Boston University.

KICK HIM

They pin him between the curb of the street and a car and hit and kick him before his fellow marchers fall on his body, protecting him with their own.

The line moves on, the white hoodlums now stand calmly 2 yards from the line waiting for the next white, me.

I see them and I know I'm going to get it. The Negro girl with whom I'm walking knows it too and grabs my glasses.

The whites let me pass and then attack from my rear, the first punch hits the back of my neck, then two or three hit me all at once and I am down on the ground trying to cover up my vital areas.

STOP KICKING

For 20 or 30 seconds, they kick me, but suddenly stop. They're getting scared

themselves by this time for what if the Negroes become violent, and anyway this "white nigger" (me) won't be back again.

I pick myself off the ground and find my trousers and shirt ripped. A local cop is within 10 yards of me. He has been there throughout my beating.

We make our way back to the church and hear the speakers tell us that "you have to work and suffer for freedom," and you should have pity for those who have to resort to violence to stop us.

BACK MARCHING

The next night we are back marching—for us a nonviolent march—for the Klan another chance to beat the "niggers," black and white.

The purpose of these marches and the wade-ins at St. Augustine Beach is to contain the violence of the Klan.

By offering our own bodies as witnesses for Christ Martin Luther King preaches we are actually halting violence.

ACID, KNIVES

The sight of nonviolent demonstrators being brutally attacked with iron pipes, acid, knives, and other weapons should so horrify this Nation that eventually so much public pressure should be built up that St. Augustine will have to protect all of its citizens.

In addition, by these demonstrations, the Klan shows itself for what it is. As Rev. C. F. Vivian, director of affiliates for SCLC puts it, "Our marches have made the Klan show their faces. Now, they can be counted and pointed out. The merchants can see them for the kind of little people they are."

The presence of the moderating and organizing influence of SCLC in St. Augustine is the only factor that saves this city from all-out race war.

(SCLC is the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.)

This organization with Martin Luther King as its leader came into St. Augustine when a race war was a distinct possibility and convinced the people of the Negro community that nonviolence was the only moral and practical way to attain equal rights.

Using the Bible, the example of Christ, and the hatred by which the segregationist lives, the leaders, mostly ministers, have convinced the local Negroes that "you should love these segregationists and forgive them even as they are beating you."

The SCLC picked St. Augustine as the starting point in their plans for direct action this summer. It seemed a fairly easy town to crack because of its dependence on tourism.

SCLC thought that if it could show the "real St. Augustine" a segregated town of hatred and violence, economic survival would necessitate giving in to Negroes demands for equality.

BECOMES APPARENT

But it has become apparent that segregation is so deeply imbedded in the minds of the whites that an easy solution is impossible.

In addition, the Ku Klux Klan has decided to make its stand in St. Augustine, and today over a thousand of them practically rule the town.

To show the extend of Klan control over even the State police sent in by the Governor, last Thursday night four klansmen under arrest were taken by force from the State patrol cars in which they were riding by fellow klansmen.

James Hauser, a Negro working at Fairchild Aircraft in St. Augustine, was beaten up 2 months ago by white workers.

He identified three of his attackers immediately but to this time the case is still under investigation and no arrests have been made.

But surrounded by this violence and hatred the Negroes of St. Augustine continue to fight.

They have suffered too long to give up. For centuries they have been in physical, economic and physiological slavery and nothing can be worse than what they have gone through.

As the Negro spiritual goes, "Before I'll be a slave, I'll be buried in my grave, and go home to my Lord and be free."

Speaking at the Washington march last summer, Dr. King said, "We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights 'when will you be satisfied?'"

"We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality.

HEAVY WITH FATIGUE

"We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

"We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one.

"We cannot be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

"No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream."

The Negro of St. Augustine believes in the aged-old "American dream" and this is why he does not rebel against his country.

But he has also run out of patience, he wants his share now. In St. Augustine he is fighting for it.

WICHITA, KANS., THE AIR CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Wichita, Kans., is truly the air capital of the world—or, as it has been called, the Detroit of the air.

The complex of companies producing and modifying both civilian and military aircraft in Wichita has assigned it a continuing role of importance in America's air transportation, space, and defense future.

The Boeing Co. Wichita plant has been the production center for hundreds of B-47 and B-52 aircraft, which have guaranteed air superiority for the Strategic Air Command. Today, the plant's function has shifted, as the B-47's and B-52's are no longer in production; but the B-52's continue as a major segment of our retaliatory force, and are, in addition, being modified for other uses. The company's experience and the talents of its personnel are being called upon to satisfy our demands to dominate outer space. Upwards of 18,000 aviation workers are involved in this company's activities in Wichita.

Cessna and Beech are internationally known producers of smaller military and civilian aircraft. Together, they produce 61 percent of the 7,569 private planes produced in this country last year. Their work for the military continues to be imaginative and essential. Together with the newest arrival on the Wichita aviation scene, Lear-Jet Corp., the 3 companies now employ 10,000 employees, with a payroll of over \$70 million a year.

Lear-Jet Corp., while new in Wichita, is well known in aviation circles. Later this week, Lear expects to receive the

Federal Aviation Administration's certification of its new Executive Jet—a plane which will make its mark in private aviation, along with those of its companions in Wichita—Cessna and Beechcraft.

Kansas and the country are proud of the active and imaginative aviation industries centered in Wichita. I ask unanimous consent that a feature article entitled "Why Wichita Is Abuzz With Private Planes," from the National Observer of July 20, 1964, be printed in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, July 20, 1964]
THE DETROIT OF THE AIR: WHY WICHITA IS ABUZZ WITH PRIVATE PLANES

WICHITA, KANS.—Huge aircraft factories spread like weeds through the wheatfields outside this city. But despite this seeming incongruity, a brief flight over the countryside shows that Wichita's role as the Detroit of the private plane industry is no accident.

The Arkansas River is the only break in a runway-flat terrain. The air is so clear that once you are airborne, you quickly spot the large grain elevator at Hutchinson, 45 miles to the northwest. Wichita averages 26 days of unlimited visibility a month, year around. From Wichita's central location, light planes can fly nonstop to most cities. These are reasons why Wichita has attracted factories that built 61 percent of the 7,569 private planes produced in the United States last year.

This year that percentage may rise. Both of Wichita's two big private plane builders, Cessna Aircraft Co. and Beech Aircraft Corp., last week announced that their sales in the 9 months ended June 30 exceeded sales for the entire previous fiscal year. On July 24, Wichita's other private plane builder, Lear Jet Corp., expects to receive Federal Aviation Agency certification on its executive jet, and make its first delivery in early August to Rexall Drug & Chemical Co.

Planes dominate Wichita's economy. Cessna, Beech, and Lear-Jet pay their 10,000 employees more than \$70 million a year. That is well over 10 percent of the manufacturing payroll for the entire State of Kansas. Further, Boeing Co. has a huge military aircraft installation here, employing another 18,000 aviation workers.

Even now, privately owned planes carry 85 million passengers a year, about 25 million more than the airlines carry annually. And with new lines of planes and continued growth of light plane travel, Wichita's plane builders should have many brisk years ahead.

GROWTH RATE OF 10 PERCENT

Dwane Wallace, Cessna president, figures the demand for private planes is growing at 10 percent a year. Equally confident is William P. Lear, who moved Lear-Jet to Wichita 2 years ago. "It's vital, with a capital 'V,' for the Nation's survival that industry decentralize to overcome urban congestion," he explains. "And as you decentralize industry, the need for executive planes goes up."

He sees a change in the role of the executive plane. Until now, he contends, most corporate planes have served as taxicabs, hauling executive from small airports to larger ones, where businessmen hop aboard commercial jets. This has been because of the limited range of many light planes, which flew at low altitudes, often in choppy air, because they lacked pressurization.

"Now we can beat the big jets," Mr. Lear says enthusiastically, and a bit inaccurately.

(His Lear Jet crosses the country in just over 5 hours, counting a necessary fuel stop. A big jet can do it in under 5 hours.) New more expensive models of propeller planes that Cessna and Beech are building also should help upgrade the role of business airplanes.

Already that role is an important one. American business now flies 34,500 executive planes, more than the total aircraft operated by the Armed Forces and commercial airlines combined. Yet there is plenty of potential. Only 360 of the Nation's 3,000 largest corporations own their own planes. By 1970 industry figures to have 80,000 business planes flying.

TRAVELING FOR PLEASURE

And there are many other uses for light planes. They serve other business purposes—crop dusting, ranching, and patrolling oil pipelines. Government experts figure that private planes are flown an additional 3,500,000 hours a year solely for pleasure travel, about as many flying hours as are accumulated annually by the Nation's airliners.

Further, there's a brisk export trade. Cessna exports a quarter of its production. Beech, which sells 30 to 35 percent of its planes abroad, recently flew 15 twin-engine planes south for use as trainers and transports by Brazil's air force.

Yet the planemakers still have a selling job ahead of them. One problem is getting potential customers to overcome the fear of flying in light planes. "It's quite a problem getting people to realize a light plane is safe as a car, and a lot more convenient," says one executive. To demonstrate his thesis, he delights in taking a visitor aloft in a single engine plane, purposely stalling it, then resuming power.

A more tangible problem: The continuing effort to induce owners of small airports to keep them open, rather than sell the strips off for housing developments. But no such problem exists here. Landing fields abound. Cessna and Beech operate busy company fields, hard by the huge Boeing-Air Force facility. Planes are constantly taking off.

IT PACKS A WHINE

The nine-seat Lear Jet comes in just one model, which looks small but packs a whine as loud as any commercial jet. By contrast the propeller planes built by Cessna come in 13 models, selling from \$7,825 for a two-seater to a \$76,950 twin-engine plane, seating up to six. Single-engine planes dominated last year's Cessna production of 3,456 planes.

Beech, however, powers 80 percent of its production with two engines, selling eight propeller models from \$13,300 to \$140,000. About half the 1,061 planes Beech sold last year cost more than Cessna's most expensive model.

Both companies are building new models. Cessna plans delivery early next year of its twin-engine model 411 to compete with the more expensive Beech models. Carrying up to 7 passengers, it will sell for \$120,000, cruise at 230 miles per hour at 16,000 feet, and have a 1,000-mile range.

Beech is upgrading its line with the King Air, a pressurized, turbo-prop plane that cruises at 270 miles per hour, and has a 1,400-mile range, carries 6 to 8 passengers. Its price: \$300,000 to \$400,000, depending upon electronic equipment. Beech anticipates delivering 14 King Airs this year, with production reaching the rate of one a week by year's end.

EIGHTY-FOUR MINUTES TO CHICAGO

Across town, at the north end of Wichita Municipal Airport, Mr. Lear is building the most expensive executive plane produced in Wichita. The first production model of the Lear Jet—N801L—flew its maiden flight last fall, but was destroyed by fire in a crash landing 2 miles south of the airport runway

a month ago during single engine takeoff tests. The pilot, who escaped uninjured, forgot to position certain wing flaps, enabling the plane to get only 70 feet into the air, Lear Jet says. The second production model, N802L, has since completed the qualification tests.

And the Lear Jet turned out to be quite a plane, able to climb to 40,000 feet in 13 minutes, cruise at 570 miles per hour, and whisk an executive from New York to Chicago in 84 minutes.

Selling at \$575,000, the sleek white jet with twin pods astride the rear of the fuselage is cheaper than any competing executive jet. Since it weighs 2 tons less than any other executive jet—there are a half dozen competing executive jets on the market—it's also more economical and speedy, Lear officials say.

But to build it fast and light, Mr. Lear sacrificed interior space, resulting in a somewhat cramped cabin. Explains Mr. Lear: "People don't ride in airplanes to get comfortable. They ride to get someplace." He figures to deliver 14 of his jets by year's end, with production reaching a rate of 8 to 10 a month by January.

Cessna, Beech, and Wichita's airplane business began long before Mr. Lear's spirited little jet. In 1917 Clyde V. Cessna, who died a decade ago, flew the first plane built here. He and other plane builders were lured to Wichita by air races sponsored by local oilmen. At one time about 30 airplane companies were headquartered in Wichita.

BOTTLE SHAPED FUSELAGE

The industry here has produced an interesting trio of executives. Mr. Lear, 62, might have coined the cliché about the American dream. He parlayed a sixth-grade education, a knack for business, an interest in flying, and what he calls the "ability to see a market before it develops" into an electronics-aviation empire. After selling out, he decided to invest \$12 million of that fortune into his compact jet, with its Coke bottle shaped fuselage.

Cessna's Mr. Wallace, 52, has spent his entire adult life at Cessna. He joined the company after college under the guidance of his uncle, Mr. Cessna. And though he soon became company president, he spent many of his early years in that job flying in air races to give Cessna planes publicity. Occasionally he had to rush back to Wichita with a purse to meet the company payroll.

Mr. Wallace still does a lot of his own flying on business trips. After work he occasionally drives the few hundred yards from his office to the Cessna hangar to take a brief pleasure spin.

Mrs. Olive A. Beech, 60, has headed Beech since the 1950 death of her husband, Walter Beech. Highly respected by the rest of the executive plane builders, she nevertheless is quite touchy about being one of the few presidents of a manufacturing company who happens to be a woman.

Like Mr. Wallace and Mr. Lear, she is a persuasive advocate of executive planes. But unlike her male competitors, she never learned to pilot a plane. "I never had to; there was always someone else to do it," she explains. Wichita's plane industry is banking on the expectation that other executives won't follow Mrs. Beech's lead on that subject.

FOREIGN AID—OPERATIONS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the time is at hand when the Senate will be considering foreign aid legislation and foreign aid appropriations. In this connection,

I think it is appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the results, to date, of the special hearings which the Senate Appropriations Committee conducted last year with respect to "Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development." More particularly, I wish to make available AID's response to the conclusions and recommendations of my report which was based upon these hearings—Senate Document No. 57.

The special hearings went into the administration and operations of the AID agency in great detail, and attempted to equate personnel administration and qualifications with the vast responsibilities with which the Agency was charged, on the premise that proper management and implementation of our infinitely complex and far-reaching foreign assistance programs is quite as important as the amount of money which goes into such programs.

In brief, my report pointed out the nearly devastating effects which successive reorganizations and frequent changes of leadership over a period of the past 15 years have had on the stability and morale of this Agency, which must carry out responsibilities of such tremendous proportions. It called for a stabilizing period and longer tenure for key personnel with the proper qualifications. From the information at hand, I believe the Agency is on the way to making marked accomplishments in this regard.

The report was also highly critical of overstaffing in both American and local employees in certain countries and programs, while inadequate attention and personnel were given to the multi-billion-dollar loan and Public Law 480 programs. It criticized the lack of adequate coordination between the economic and military assistance programs; the use of outright grants in situations where loans would have sufficed; and the making of excessively soft-term loans with low interest rates, long grace periods, and long-term maturity, where more normal terms appeared appropriate. It stressed the necessity for a more realistic and frugal approach in these areas. It pointed out the critical need for an independent group within the Agency to make objective evaluations of Agency programs, and the failure of the Agency to give adequate support to the organization which it had doing this work.

My report also went into considerable detail with respect to the need for improvements in personnel administration. It was severely critical of the totally inadequate procedures employed in its contract operations, and cited the necessity for the Agency to include in its budget presentations estimates as to the approximate amount it intended spending in each major program area, so that Congress might make a judgment as to whether particular programs were receiving too little or too much attention.

The report also made recommendations with respect to corrective action to be taken in each of the above areas.

The response which AID has made to these conclusions and recommendations is quite heartening, as it reflects a concerted action to make improvements in many areas. I would also like to feel that the reduction of nearly \$1.5 billion from last year in the current year's budget request bears more than a distant relationship to the work which went into the Senate committee's study.

This detailed response for AID should serve to permit Senate Appropriations Committee members to follow up specific issues where additional improvement is indicated and give a better understanding of the problems involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments and report of action taken on the conclusions and recommendations in my report on "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development," including a list of dollar development loans made at three-fourths of 1 percent, as approved by AID through December 1963, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1964.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Agency has completed its review of the "Report on Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development" which Senator GALE W. MCGEE submitted to your committee in November 1963.

We are always appreciative of the constructive comments, suggestions and recommendations received from you and the members of your committee. We have found this report most helpful in evaluating and improving the operations of the Agency for International Development.

A copy of our comments on the report recommendations is attached for your information and the information of the members of the committee. Copies of the Agency's comments are being sent also to Senator McGEE.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1964.

The Honorable GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: We have completed a review of your report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on Personnel Administration and Operations of the Agency for International Development. Our detailed comments on each of the specific recommendations are attached. A copy of the Agency's comments is being sent to the committee also, as indicated in the attached letter to Senator HAYDEN.

I am most appreciative of your personal efforts in connection with these hearings and of the comprehensive and constructive approach taken in your report on problems being encountered in the administration of the foreign assistance program. Our senior management officials have given your comments and recommendations very serious consideration.

You will note in our attached comments that we have taken many constructive steps

along the lines recommended in the report. In other instances we consider the steps taken to be consonant with the objectives of your report.

As you know from our personal discussions, I have placed considerable emphasis on improving the administration and management of our program. The special hearings held by the committee presented an excellent opportunity to discuss the complexities of our personnel and related problems and to get the benefit of the ideas and suggestions from the members of the committee for improving our operations.

We feel sure that you will agree that the attached comments which indicate the improvements already made and being actively pursued will do much toward improving the Agency's operations. We appreciate the stimulation your report has provided to our management improvement program and shall be pleased to furnish any additional information which you may consider necessary.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

COMMENTS AND REPORTS OF ACTION TAKEN ON
THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
IN THE REPORT OF SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE
ON PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERA-
TIONS OF AID

RECOMMENDATION 1

Summary of conclusions: "One of the most critical needs of the Agency is for more objective and effective evaluation of its programs and projects."

Recommendation 1a: "It is recommended that the Agency take the necessary steps to equip itself with a field evaluation and survey group equal to the task of conducting adequate, objective evaluations—as a constructive aid to management and the elimination of waste and ill-conceived projects. It is recommended that the committee follow the action taken in this regard."

Agency comment: AID is taking a number of actions to strengthen and expand its mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and to insure that projects and activities are achieving the development goals set for them, are ably administered and are furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. These actions include:

(a) An operations evaluation staff has been established in the Office of the Administrator. Under the supervision of the Deputy Administrator, this staff is the focal point for planning, arranging, and conducting periodic evaluations of Agency operations. These evaluations will place primary emphasis on the performance of mission and headquarters staffs in carrying out approved policies and programs in the aid-receiving countries.

The AID operations evaluation program is designed to meet the Administrator's need for an internal mechanism to provide objective assessment of the operational performance and effectiveness of the USAID's and headquarters in carrying out approved programs projects. This executive review program, implemented by carefully selected evaluation teams, will encompass all aspects of AID's operational performance, in addition to an appraisal of program objectives, suitability of projects, loan/grant ratios, and overall responsiveness of programs to current U.S. goals and objectives.

These objectives are to be met by establishment of a planned program of comprehensive, onsite operations evaluations conducted in the USAID's by teams of senior officers assigned by AID/W. These evaluations will focus on AID's progress in achieving previously approved goals and targets in respect to the aid-receiving countries. Each operations evaluation will result in reports and recommendations as guides for im-

mediate management action by the responsible officials.

Operations evaluations will not substitute for or lessen the responsibilities of USAID's, regional bureaus, and AID/W offices for self-evaluation measures and management improvement actions in the activities for which they are responsible. Corrective action to comply with recommendations resulting from an operations evaluation will be the responsibility of the affected USAID Director and regional Assistant Administrator.

(b) The President has indicated his intention of providing for an external evaluation of the effectiveness of assistance programs through the creation of a bipartisan General Advisory Committee on the foreign aid program. The Committee members will be men and women of outstanding reputation drawn from the ranks of the U.S. private community. This Committee will be called upon to provide objectives and informed evaluations of AID programs in key countries.

The above actions are in addition to an expansion of the Agency's present comprehensive internal audit system which reviews program implementation and administrative operations in addition to the usual financial examinations.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Summary of conclusions: " * * * where the United States * * * contributes * * * the greatest portion of a country's budget in its fight against communism, it appears to do so * * * without the coordination and safeguards necessary to prevent * * * corruption and the diversion * * * of our assistance into the wrong hands. While the responsibility for perfecting and insisting upon such safeguards is certainly not entirely within the responsibilities of AID personnel, the Administrator of AID, by law, is cloaked with coordinating authority for military and economic programs. If, in practice, as well may be, the AID Administrator is not in a position to enforce adequate control to assure effective use of our aid, the administration should devise whatever steps are necessary."

Recommendation 2: "It is recommended that a general review be made of this whole problem area and that the necessary steps be taken to correct it. Further, it is suggested that the committee request the Administrator of the Agency to report back to the committee, within 3 months of the date of this report, furnishing the action and steps that are being taken in this regard."

Agency comment: This recommendation relates to military force maintenance support and to economic program assistance.

Force maintenance support provided under the military assistance program is directly administered by the Department of Defense. Supplies financed by the military assistance program are procured by the U.S. armed services and are supplied to the recipient defense ministries through logistical, directly administered channels. MAP does not make use of commercial markets, bank financing or host country budget controls, although final use of supplied material is the responsibility of the recipient Ministry of Defense. The Department of Defense procures directly, ships, and delivers by its own order, and supervises the introduction and use of MAP-supplied material.

This system is very effective for supplementing and improving the defense capabilities of recipient countries and is a natural outgrowth of the procurement and supply system of the U.S. Armed Forces. Only in those situations such as Korea, Vietnam, and Laos, where a radical expansion of the activity of the Defense Ministry has been involved, under combat conditions and with military assistance financing a very large share of operating costs, does this system

run into substantial difficulties. In these situations where an initially weak administrative structure has had an impossible expansion forced upon it, the danger of diversion and corruption would have been far greater were it not for the extensive involvement of U.S. military advisers, trainers, and administrators in the supply and administration of MAP-financed material. The monitoring and counsel provided not only assures proper use of U.S.-supplied material, but greatly strengthens the military administration of the recipient country.

Economic program assistance, in contrast to MAP and to economic project assistance, is the provision of financing in connection with the general situation, including filling a balance-of-payments gap, sustaining and stabilizing an economy strained by common defense efforts, or providing assistance necessary to achieve a general policy purpose. During the past year AID has conducted a general review of the provision of program assistance and has published new manual orders establishing policy criteria and review and approval procedures for such assistance.

The basic principle followed by AID in the administration of assistance of this character in order to avoid corruption and diversion, is to use the existing systems for the control of resources in the recipient country and, most particularly, to make full use of the automatic controls provided by commercial transactions in the open market. AID implements the congressional mandate to utilize commercial channels of trade in program assistance by financing private imports into aid recipient countries. While such transactions have the protection of competitive market forces and cooperating country controls, they are also surrounded by a safeguard of AID regulations, which impose maximum price rules, standards for contracting, and require effective utilization of commodities. In addition AID limits its programs to essential commodities and requires the borrower/grantee to permit audit to ascertain full utilization and to insure that aid goods are not reexported. Compliance with these rules is obtained by requiring the aided countries and suppliers to agree to make appropriate refund to AID for violation of its regulations. Moreover, the financing of private transactions is arranged through the facilities of U.S. banks, which examine documentation prior to payment. Further examination is made by the AID controller's office in post audit. No system, in practice, offers perfect defense against error and fraud. The system employed by AID is no exception to this principle but it has enabled the Agency to generally insure the satisfaction of U.S. procurement standards since Marshall plan days and has resulted in refunds of more than \$430 million in program and project assistance. The AID controllership organization is responsible for followup on program assistance as it is for other AID assistance, to assure that assistance was provided within the terms approved and in accordance with law and that commodities financed were not diverted, were eligible for AID financing and were constructively used within the recipient economy.

Sparing use is made of grant program assistance by AID. It is required in half a dozen countries, particularly including Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Jordan, which are bearing common defense burdens larger than their economies will support. This form of assistance is also provided on a loan basis to countries which have prepared comprehensive development programs and investment plans with which AID concurs and which we have agreed to support. In India, Pakistan, Turkey, Colombia, and Chile a substantial part of AID assistance is provided through commodity financing under pro-

gram loans in support of the country's development program.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Summary of conclusions: "There is another too common situation to which AID personnel are a party but over which they do not have full control. This involves U.S. overindulgence of certain countries in our aid giving. It has taken the form of outright grants where loans would have sufficed; furnishing the full costs of technical assistance projects, when the recipient country could well have afforded to pay the local, or even total, costs; making little or no effort to obtain any interest on many huge deposits in foreign banks, and making grants and exceedingly soft-term loans to countries well on their way to prosperity."

Recommendation 3: "It is recommended, first, that the top policymaking officials and bodies in the executive branch take precautions against creating conditions or an atmosphere which permits a prodigal attitude in the disbursing of U.S. resources in the name of foreign aid; secondly, that the AID organization perfect procedures of review, staffed with men of experience and common-sense, which will reduce to a minimum grants, soft-term loans, and other assistance where the circumstances do not warrant it; and, finally, that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress consider placing restrictions and conditions on appropriations which will impress on AID that the funds appropriated are not to be committed indiscriminately, but with a sense of frugality."

Agency comment: The President has repeatedly emphasized his policy that foreign assistance should be used as economically as possible to achieve U.S. policy objectives, and the Administrator has taken precautions to insure this result.

In this connection we would like to point out:

1. AID grants have declined as a share of economic assistance from 98.7 percent in 1953 and 76.4 percent in 1958 to 47 percent in 1962, and 41.6 percent in 1963 and 31 percent projected for 1965. This trend will continue.

2. Fourteen countries received \$420 million in grant support in 1960 for which no supporting assistance is proposed for 1965. Total grants other than for technical cooperation were \$1,121 million in 1960 compared to \$654 million in fiscal year 1963 and about \$370 to \$400 million anticipated for fiscal year 1964 for total supporting assistance and contingency fund grants.

3. The Agency has scrupulously followed the requirements of section 611 of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, which pertain to the "Completion of plans and cost estimates" before agreements are executed in excess of \$100,000.

4. AID withheld \$240 million of development funds from obligation in 1963, mainly because potential recipients failed to qualify under AID criteria for self-help and project evaluation.

5. The proposed foreign assistance program for fiscal 1965 is based on conservative estimates of the minimum amounts needed to meet priority requirements both for economic assistance and for military assistance. The amounts proposed are substantially less than the Administrator feels would best serve U.S. interests if optimum policies and conditions were to be found in recipient countries, but is based on a realistic estimate that in fact a number of recipient countries will find it impossible to take self-help measures which we, and frequently their own leaders, agree are desirable and essential if best use is to be made of U.S. assistance.

We do not believe additional restrictions and conditions on our appropriations are necessary or desirable. The authorizing leg-

islation now provides strict and sound policy guidance and criteria.

With respect to the question of interest on deposits the U.S. Treasury Department as a matter of policy treats all U.S.-owned foreign currencies in all countries, where there are no restrictions on premature withdrawal, as fungible assets for the purpose of determining how much can be placed in interest-bearing accounts. Treasury follows the policy of attempting to place on time deposit local currencies in excess of a 30-day supply. AID has instituted action to require USAID's to report to AID/W monthly any funds available for deposit in interest-bearing accounts for referral to Treasury for appropriate action.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Summary of conclusions: "The facts indicate that numerous field missions are over-staffed—and that corrective action was being taken."

Recommendation 4: "It is recommended not only that the operating personnel of AID continue their efforts of review and the elimination of unnecessary positions in the Agency and field missions, but that independent surveys and objective evaluations be conducted for this purpose. It is suggested that AID be requested to report back to the committee within 6 months as to the progress made in this regard."

Agency comment: The Agency has taken a series of positive actions, beginning in July 1963, to assure that only essential personnel are assigned to the overseas missions.

One of the key features of the program is to require each year an advance plan of specific actions to be taken at each level of the organization to improve Agency operations. These plans provide concrete management goals for the Agency against which improvements and economies can be measured. In addition, through a system of periodic reports, the various efforts being made throughout the Agency to increase productivity and operational efficiency are coordinated; duplication of effort is eliminated; and maximum application of the benefits derived from improved operations is insured. Thus, the Agency now has a continuing action program for economizing, simplifying, and accelerating its operations.

1. A major cutback in employment is underway: The Agency is determined to reverse the historical upward trend in staff levels and to find ways of doing its job with substantially fewer personnel. To achieve this objective, AID is taking the following actions:

(a) Critically reviewing each country mission and each Washington unit to eliminate every job of marginal value.

(b) Eliminating projects and activities which are not of high priority.

(c) Steadily expanding the use of facilities of other Government agencies and the private U.S. community in lieu of direct AID development and execution of technical assistance projects.

As a result of this new and firmly enforced Agency policy, total employment is being reduced this fiscal year and further significant cuts will be made in fiscal year 1965. Staffing will be decreased from 16,782 as of June 30, 1963, to 16,500 as of June 30, 1964. Between June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965, AID staff will be further reduced by an additional 900 United States and foreign national employees. Thus in a period of 2 years, total AID employment will be reduced by about 1,200 employees. Anticipated employment as of June 30, 1965, is 15,600—6,480 U.S. nationals and 9,120 local employees.

2. A comprehensive survey of the Agency's manpower management processes has been undertaken by AID with the assistance and cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget: This survey has now been completed, and

we are now putting into effect new methods and approaches to increase the effectiveness of manpower programing, to tighten internal controls on employment and to redesign the employment statistics system in order to make it a more effective management control device.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Summary of conclusions: "One of the principal factors which has contributed to our ill-advised or overly ambitious projects is the fact that the United States too frequently pays practically all the costs of such projects. Accordingly it would seem that there should be a requirement as a condition to the initiation of technical assistance projects in most instances, that the recipient country contribute a significant part of or all local costs in some form, and in many countries, the full or major costs of the entire project."

Recommendation 5a: "It is recommended that the Agency, as a condition to approval of technical assistance projects, set up procedures requiring that recipient countries make substantial contributions to the local costs of such projects in some form, and that a higher percentage of countries pay the complete costs, or a major percentage thereof, and that AID, in its budget presentation to Congress, present estimates of recipient country contributions in each case to the local costs, and what portion of the total cost of each project such contribution represents."

Recommendation 5b: "It is further recommended that the Agency report back to the committee on the feasibility of carrying out this recommendation and any problems involved. It is also recommended that the Appropriations Committees consider making this a requirement in a high percentage of all new projects."

Agency comment: We agree strongly with the sense of the report that technical assistance like any other assistance must be a joint effort if it is to be effective; that there must be evidence of keen recipient country interest in any major technical assistance project, and that there should be willingness and ability to contribute substantially to the activity and ultimately to carry it on. This is one aspect of self-help which is increasingly a crucial criterion in determining what assistance should be provided. This criterion is firmly established in foreign assistance legislation in that section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act requires the President to take into account the willingness of the country "to pay a fair share of the cost of programs under this title."

RECOMMENDATION 6

Summary of conclusion: "The Agency was still very much in the process of completing the staffing and organization necessary to carry out the loan functions for which the Agency is responsible—the [loan] program was understaffed in both numbers and experience, and that there was an insufficient appreciation of what was required to make a program of this magnitude work. It is inconceivable that a development loan operation of this size can be operated effectively with personnel who have little or no investment banking experience."

Recommendation 6: "It is recommended that continued high priority be given to the building of a better balanced loan staff, at both the Washington and field levels, and that every attempt be made to employ the services of an investment banker with outstanding reputation and abilities to head up the Agency's loan operation, with authority to take whatever steps are necessary to make it work with a high degree of professional proficiency."

Agency comment: Action is already underway to strengthen our loan staff and to augment it where necessary in both Washington

and field operations. The recently completed AID implementation project—a hard internal look at program operations—came up with the basic findings that more and better people were needed on the capital development side of our personnel ledger and that additional efforts must be directed at the implementation and monitoring of loan programs. Major studies of the loan operations of three regional bureaus have now been completed and recommendations designed to overcome operating deficiencies are now being implemented. We now have positions for 61 professionals to work on loan matters in the four Regional Bureaus in Washington and for 42 professionals in our overseas missions. To assist them there are 42 engineering positions assigned to the regional bureaus and 153 positions overseas. There are also lawyers, controllers and auditors assigned both in Washington and overseas who are available to assist our loan officers.

As a part of the Agency's recently inaugurated management improvement program, we will initiate before the end of the fiscal year a comprehensive study to assess loan operation personnel needs for the next 2 fiscal years as the loan program expands and more loans enter the implementation stage.

The central staff office with primary responsibility for the development of Agency policy in the lending field is the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. We have just appointed an Associate Assistant Administrator for Capital Development who has international banking experience and who will fill the role outlined by the committee.

RECOMMENDATION 7

Summary of conclusions: "There are indications that the Agency has carried to excess the making of long-term loans at three-quarters of 1 percent interest, with long grace periods, and that certain countries have received such loans when more normal terms would have sufficed as well."

Recommendation 7: "It is recommended that the Agency submit, at the time of the appropriations hearings, a list of all loans made at three-quarters of 1 percent, including the name of the country and the terms of the loans, together with a summary reflecting the percentage of such loans in relation to the total development loans made since the three-quarters of 1 percent interest loans were authorized; also, that the Agency be prepared to justify its action in reference to all loans made at the lower interest rate."

Agency comment: In accordance with this recommendation, the Agency is submitting separately a list of loans made at three-quarters of 1 percent interest and the summary, as requested.

AID policy has taken into account the ability to repay external debt to those countries that have shown progress toward self-sustaining growth or that have relatively good foreign exchange earning capacity. For example, recent dollar development loans to the Government of Israel, to the Republic of China, to the Government of Thailand, to the Government of Venezuela, to the Government of Mexico, to the Government of Greece, and to the Government of Iran have all been made at rates higher than the legal minimum and maturities shorter than the legal maximum.

AID has pressed other free world countries to follow similar rules in their programs of lending for development and in April 1963, the 12 countries in the Development Assistance Committee agreed that loan terms should be consistent with the debt-servicing capacity of the recipient countries, that terms should be more nearly comparable among donors, and that these aims should be met by liberalizing the terms of the harder lenders.

RECOMMENDATION 8

Summary of conclusions: "The Public Law 480 programs have been badly understaffed and given inadequate attention. While AID has done much to improve the overseas administration of these programs, a great deal more must be done."

Recommendation 8a: "It is recommended, first, that the Agency make a concerted effort to correct the misconceptions held by many of the AID employees regarding the Public Law 480, title I, program."

Agency comment: AID recognizes the need for better understanding within the Agency and generally of the purposes and objectives of the title I program. To increase employee understanding three training films are in preparation. These 15-minute films are designed to present graphically a general explanation of the Public Law 480 program, and give specific understandings of the titles I and IV programs, the barter program and the essentials with respect to the titles II and III grant and donation food programs. The Food for Peace Newsletter is issued monthly containing current highlights of the programs in the various countries and made available to all personnel and prominent space is given to the various Public Law 480 programs in Front Lines, the Agency's internal semimonthly newspaper for employees.

Official instructions on the title I program are contained in M.O. 1142.1 which was issued September 30, 1963. A handbook is also in preparation covering Public Law 480 generally with detailed sections on each of the titles.

Recommendation 8b: "It is further recommended that the Agency give the same consideration to Public Law 480, title I, 104(g) loans as is given to development loans made from funds directly appropriated, and that a country-by-country survey be made to assure that the Public Law 480 programs are getting adequate and consistent attention."

Agency comment: Recent evolution and changes in the administration of the Public Law 480 program will help to assure that all aspects of it including section 104(g) loans get adequate and consistent attention. The planning, negotiation and implementation of "country use" sales proceeds for development or the common defense is explicitly an AID responsibility. This includes loans to American private enterprise in the country and loans and any grants to the cooperating government.

Because they derive from the sales agreement process and are a partial reflection of commodities already supplied, the section 104(g) loans differ in a fundamental fashion from AID dollar development loans. The approval of a dollar development loan is the approval of a transfer of resources from the United States to the recipient country. The corresponding approval in the Public Law 480 title I picture is the approval of the sales agreement. The section 104(g) loan is provided for in that agreement and is a reflection of it.

Recommendation 8c: "It is also recommended that AID be required to justify before Congress any grants made for economic assistance under section 104(e) of title I, and any outright grants made with Public Law 480 currencies originally designated for U.S. uses, regardless of whether or not the benefiting countries happen to be so-called excess currency countries."

Agency comment: The authority to use a share of title I currencies on a grant basis is extremely important to the usefulness of this program for foreign policy purposes. Occasionally a non-revenue-producing activity is a critical element in a country program and the ability to provide some grant financing for it gives the United States an extremely valuable negotiating leverage. For example, a recent sale agreement with Brazil included assistance for the anti-Communist north-

east program and one in the Sudan included a grant for expansion of the university. In both cases, inclusion of the grant was an important element in making the title I sale a positive element in U.S. relations with the country.

In recent years, very sparing use has been made of the grant authority. Less than 5 percent of sales proceeds of fiscal year 1963 agreements are to be used for grants compared to a 30-percent level in previous years. This drastic drop is due in part to following a tighter policy and part of the fact that during 1963 it was not necessary to renew the large long-term sale agreements with India and Pakistan. In both of these countries local currencies freely available for U.S. use within the country greatly exceed U.S. expenditure requirements both in terms of cash on hand and for the more distant future, as large outstanding loans are repaid in rupees.

With one exception grants have not been made with Public Law 480 currencies designated for U.S. uses. The single exception in recent years has been the unique situation in Nepal where Indian rupees are acceptable in payment for local costs. Here AID has been able to substantially expand its development program without dollar cost to the United States by drawing Indian rupees under an allocation from the Bureau of the Budget for the payment of program local costs in Nepal. This arrangement has been made with the consent of the Indian Government.

All Public Law 480 grants are reported to the Congress semiannually in the reports on Public Law 480 operations, and the terms of all new sales agreements are reported currently to the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate. It is our intention to continue the current policy of making sparing use of the grant authority, using it only in those cases where a unique contribution to U.S. policy objectives can be obtained.

Recommendation 8d: No AID comment is warranted.

Recommendation 8e: "It is recommended that much greater emphasis be placed upon the use of title II and III food donation programs by using these operations as the basis for building toward community responsibility and self-help projects, and that, insofar as possible, they be made more than mere humanitarian projects through conversion into programs having a schedule looking to the overall improvement of the lot of the recipients to the point where they will be self-sustaining; and that the local governments be urged to assume greater responsibility in such projects and in the welfare of their people."

Agency comment: AID concurs in and strongly supports this recommendation and, in fact, has been directing its efforts towards making the "highest and best use" of the food resources both to serve the best interest of the recipients and of the United States. Some examples of these efforts are:

1. Increasing and continuing emphasis on title II food for work economic development programs or projects both on a government-to-government basis and through the voluntary agencies.

2. Strong AID support of the administration's request for an increase in the annual authorization for title II programs from \$300 million to \$450 million.

3. The USDA title III regulations issued November 6, 1963, provide that donated foods shall not be distributed as compensation or award for, or as a condition of the performance of services; however, this limitation permits the acceptance of voluntary services upon any public or any other nonreligious activity which has been approved by AID. AID's implementing instructions to these reg-

ulations encourage the voluntary agencies to promote self-help activities.

During the hearings before the Foreign Agricultural Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture on the extension of Public Law 480, administration witnesses indicated the intention to revise these regulations to provide that voluntary agencies are urged to promote self-help and community development activities on the part of the recipients.

Recommendation 8f: "It is further recommended that AID conduct a country-by-country review to determine whether there is adequate personnel, both in numbers and in qualifications, to assure proper administration of these food programs as they are presently operating, and that adequate personnel be added to insure against serious diversion and confusion in these programs."

Agency comment: In August 1962, AID conducted a country-by-country review of its personnel resources in relation to the food for peace program. Following this review, 12 food for peace officers (that is technicians who have principal responsibility for the conduct of the food for peace program) have been assigned to as many countries. Further continuing reviews of the food for peace program indicated a need for additional personnel. There are currently 38 food for peace officers or assistant food for peace officers serving in 23 countries and two are under consideration for assignment to 2 additional countries. In addition, in each of the other 79 countries or territories in which title II or title III programs are conducted, an employee of the USAID mission, or in those countries or territories where we do not have a USAID mission, an employee of the embassy, legation or consulate has been designated as acting food for peace officer. These food for peace officers receive training in AID/Washington either prior to departure to their post of assignment or in connection with home leave. Consideration is being given, within existing budgetary limitations, to the assignment of food for peace officers to additional countries.

Increased attention both as to staff time and audit coverage has been devoted to Public Law 480 title II and III programs during the past fiscal year. This trend is expected to continue and has been planned for fiscal year 1964.

RECOMMENDATION 9

Summary of conclusions: "The facts indicate that there are a number of other program areas where additional employees are needed; namely, qualified engineers, capital development officers, investment guarantee personnel, economists, controllers, and auditors and other specialists. The Agency indicated it was recruiting for these jobs and, to a great extent, the additional personnel would be offset by a cutback in personnel in the technical assistance and administrative areas, where there are indications of overstaffing. The facts did indicate a special need for additional controllers and auditors. In a number of countries, the lack of sufficient auditors has resulted in serious delinquencies in conducting audits of a number of important projects."

Recommendation 9: "It is recommended that the Agency carefully analyze the need for controllers and auditors on a country-by-country basis, and hire a sufficient number to do a practical and effective job."

Agency comment: The Agency concurs with the recommendation and has already taken the following implementing steps:

1. Each mission controller is required to take an inventory of all unaudited workload. The controllers are then required to make positive judgments and screen out of cumulative workload that portion which reasonably could be determined to have little or no audit potential in accordance with instructions supplied by AID/W.

2. Each mission controller is then required to weigh the remaining audit workload in terms of priorities and availability of staffing to permit better judgments on the use of available audit manpower. Mission controllers are required to prepare annual reports on their audit plans for the ensuing fiscal year and to report semiannually on their audit accomplishments during each prior 6-month period. These revised planning, reporting, and review instructions are permitting us to better identify those countries in need of greater backstopping assistance as well as additional manpower resources.

Based on a detailed study and review of the above information coupled with visits to individual missions and additional special information when required, the Agency will make a realignment of controller and auditor positions and personnel to assure compliance with the following policies:

- (a) Audit staff should be available to provide adequate audit coverage of all loans, technical assistance projects, capital projects, program assistance, local currency projects and Public Law 480 title II and III food programs. (Adequate audit coverage does not imply a 100 percent detailed audit which would not be economically justifiable but requires the employment of a professional audit approach with reviews and selective audit tests made to determine the extent of audits necessary.)

- (b) Medium and large missions with on-going programs should be staffed with adequate and well-balanced controlled personnel to be self-sufficient for performing auditing, budgeting, accounting and related financial management functions.

- (c) Smaller missions, liquidating or phased-down missions will either be staffed to perform the necessary financial management functions or will be provided full or supplemental accounting and audit coverage from a neighboring mission, an area controller office, or from AID/W.

If after realignment of controller positions it is determined that additional controller and auditor staff are considered necessary to provide adequate audit coverage, additional staff will be recruited as part of the same intensive program being developed for the other essential specialists—engineers, loan officers, food for peace officers, etc.

With respect to headquarters controller functions, continual effort is being made to make more effective use of available manpower and other resources. In increasing headquarters audit coverage, the Agency has worked out negotiations to utilize other government agency audit facilities and to use to the extent possible private accounting firms.

RECOMMENDATION 10

Summary of conclusions: "As repeatedly indicated, one of the greatest handicaps under which the Agency is working is the lack of stability due to the great many reorganizations in the Agency and particularly the many changes in the leadership and top personnel. If substantially improved operations are to be expected, the Administrator of the Agency must have longer tenure, and the key personnel must not only have proper qualifications initially, but must remain in their respective positions for longer periods than has previously been the case. The converse is equally true. Inept or unsatisfactory personnel cannot be left in their jobs for unnecessary periods of time because of weak administrative practices. Bringing greater stability through a topnotch personnel staff and advancement on merit, is one of the most important things that can be done to improve the operation of the Agency."

Recommendation 10: "It is recommended that the administration take cognizance of certain deplorable personnel conditions which have prevailed in this Agency and sup-

port it in working toward greater stability in personnel administration."

Agency comment: The conditions described in this part of the committee's conclusions were a not unexpected concomitant of the total transition into AID from its two predecessor agencies—ICA and DLF. The calendar year 1962, during which this changeover was initially accomplished, was a period of drastic structural reorganization and replacement of leadership.

Beginning almost simultaneously with the preliminary inquiries of the committee's staff, relatively early in 1963, significant gains began to be achieved in accomplishing the objectives cited in the committee report. These positive actions have included the following:

A new Assistant Administrator for Administration and a new director of personnel were appointed, whose backgrounds in both the foreign assistance area and in overseas service assure understanding and competence in achieving the goals stated in the committee's recommendation.

Further details of achievements and projections are contained in the response provided hereafter to recommendation 12 of the committee's report.

RECOMMENDATION 11

Summary of conclusions: "There exists a great lack of coordination—between the respective bureaus themselves, between the bureau operations and the administrative functions, and—between bureau operations and the Washington staff offices. Although many functions have been decentralized into the four regional bureaus, there still is an urgent need for a strong central personnel office to maintain consistency in policies and planning—and to insist on coordination between the bureaus. There is—a need for the office of engineering (to coordinate) policy and standards in the engineering field—a central contract office—to correlate and regulate—contract operations and to provide centralized information respecting contract operations."

Recommendation 11: "It is recommended that these serious deficiencies, of which the Administrator is well aware, be corrected as expeditiously as possible and that the Agency report back to the committee within 3 months after the date of this report as to the progress being made."

Agency comment: The problem of coordination among operating bureaus and between line and staff offices is probably endemic to all new or reorganized agencies of Government. The weakness was recognized by AID, and, in the past year, has been subjected to a frontal attack.

The "implementation project"—an organizational self-analysis performed by seven working groups composed of senior staff from all the major offices of AID—thoroughly reviewed the Agency's method of designing programs, selecting projects, doing business, and coordinating its activities. The immediate result of the project has been the issuance of rationally designed and clearly stated procedures governing the major fields of AID endeavor, among them capital, technical and program assistance, procurement, and private enterprise activities. In each area, there now exist uniform criteria to be considered, uniform clearance rules, uniform means of documenting, expressing, and implementing decisions that have been reached. Responsibilities and powers of the various line and staff offices in each phase of AID activity have been more clearly established.

We now have for the first time in AID a single office, the Office of Procurement Policy in the Office of Material Resources, which is responsible for continuous examination and improvement of AID's procurement policies, procedures and practices.

The Office of Material Resources is also in the final stages of developing a centralized contract reporting and information system.

The office of engineering also has a new director. A new functional statement for that office has been developed which clarifies that staff's present relationship with other major elements of the agency. We are improving communications with that segment of the U.S. business community comprised of the construction industry and the engineering professions by direct relations with the established national professional groups such as the National Society of Professional Engineers, Consulting Engineers Council, the Coordinating Committee on Relations of Engineers in Private Practice with Government, the Associated General Contractors, and the National Constructors Association.

The participant training operation has been raised from division to office status and placed under a newly appointed director.

The office of management planning, which played a central role in the implementation project and is responsible for agency follow-through regarding it, is likewise headed by a new director.

Lastly, AID's Assistant Administrator for Administration is the principal officer charged with improving the workings, procedures, and coordination of the Agency. The present incumbent assumed his duties just as the implementation project was coming to fruition and its new mechanisms policies, and procedures were going into effect. On his shoulders, assisted by the other members of the management team, will fall the principal burden of completing the job of transforming AID into a better managed, better coordinated, and more effective Agency. Important informal coordinating mechanisms have been adopted which provide policy guidance and a basis for discussing mutual problems through weekly meetings between the Assistant Administrator for Administration and the principal management officers and by a personnel council composed of representatives of the central office of personnel and the regional bureaus.

RECOMMENDATION 12

Summary of conclusions: "There are able, dedicated, career employees in this Agency who, due to a lack of adequate personnel policies, have been shuffled to positions inconsistent with their abilities and experience, to the detriment of the work of the Agency. Reportedly, there are also a number of unsatisfactory or marginal employees who, because of this same lack of personnel policies, have been retained on the rolls of the Agency for too long a period of time. There has never been an adequate career system in the Agency, nor has there ever been a workable, systematic, and equitable 'selection-out' process until the initiation early this year of such a program, which, of necessity, was limited to the Foreign Service Reserve employee category of approximately 3,200. Because of the delays in the initiation of the selection-out process, it should be carried out at the earliest possible time that it can be equitably done. Also, consideration should be given to providing means of conducting the same type of operation with respect to the civil service employees. The inservice training program in the Agency has been very inadequate—an exceedingly high number of supervising personnel in the Agency were observed to be in an 'acting' status for unduly long periods with the consequent bad effect on morale. A particularly bad record has been made in the past by slowness in transferring or terminating employees after their assignments were completed."

Recommendation 12: "It is recommended that the Agency report back to the committee within 6 months after the date of this report on the action which has been taken to correct the specific conditions cited above."

Agency comment: The deficiencies cited in the committee's statements of conclusions under this heading are recognized by AID officials and have been given serious attention. Much has already been accomplished toward their correction, and much yet remains to be done. The following details are presented both in the areas of achievement and intent.

The lack of adequate personnel policies inherited from predecessor agencies ICA and DLF had been the subject of a special effort mounted in 1962. Over 150 specific issuances were identified for revision or complete replacement. During 1963, a major part of the job was completed by the office of personnel administration. As of the end of January 1964, 76 revised or new directives had been issued or approved for issuance. Twelve others were in the clearance process or awaiting final approval, and 20 were in the drafting stage. Priority has been given to the most important Foreign Service personnel areas. This major task should be completed by the end of 1964.

Upgrading the quality and competence of AID employees is a major objective of both the organizational and procedural aspects of the Agency's overall personnel management improvement program. With a few exceptions, the placement problems resulting from the transitional period of 1961-62 have by now been resolved. Normal attrition, the retrenchment program initiated in late 1963 and projected throughout fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and new separation authorities currently being requested from the Congress will enable the Agency to complete the proper reassignment of competent and experienced employees, and to eliminate in an orderly manner those employees identified as marginal or unnecessary.

As a matter of equity, it must be recognized that previous attempts to dispose of less than adequate staff members were associated with crash programs subject to short-time limitations and resultant intensive political pressures. In its fiscal year 1965 legislative proposals, the administration is requesting flexible and continuing authority.

The selection-out program for AID overseas employees was carefully initiated in 1963. Early in 1964 the first group of employees identified for separation under the authority were notified. Plans are already underway to extend the refined and equitable procedures to additional foreign service employees before the end of fiscal year 1964.

One of the new legislative authorities previously referred to consists of the extension of the selection-out concept to the domestic service employees in the Agency's headquarters. In anticipation of approval by the Congress, plans are already being developed to revise the performance evaluation system, applicable to these employees so that marginal performance can be clearly and equitably identified and eliminated.

Considerable attention was given in 1963 to improvement of the Agency's employee training activities. Both the in-service and the orientation programs have been redesigned to stress better administration and management of the assistance programs. Closer coordination has been achieved with the staff of the Foreign Service Institute as a part of the overall review. Additional funds are being requested for fiscal year 1965 to accomplish the essential improvements.

A recent review of positions occupied on an acting basis indicated improvement in the past 12 months. Sixteen of the 20 acting incumbencies reported on page 78 of the committee's hearings have since been removed from the acting category. A relatively few positions continue to be filled by employees in an acting capacity for short

periods of time due to temporary assignments made pending new recruitments or oversea rotatees entrance on duty in AID/W.

The Agency's accomplishments in reducing oversea employee "turnaround" time in the first half of 1963 were continued throughout the year. Considering the human and cost factors involved in the oversea employment situation, it is believed maximum economy and effective manpower utilization is being achieved. The new concepts, streamlined procedures, and concentrated attention to the problem resulted in an effective operation when the U.S. AID Cambodia activity was terminated recently.

RECOMMENDATION 13

Summary of conclusions: "In the technical assistance program, practically as much money is spent for contracting services, including commodities, as is used for direct hire employment in the Agency in this area. The Agency is unable to furnish the exact number of its contract employees or to give a breakdown between the salaries and expenses costs of such contracting services and the cost of commodities which are furnished incident to such projects. This is unsatisfactory and should be corrected."

Recommendation 13: "It is recommended that the Agency maintain and furnish sufficient records to the committee to reflect complete and accurate cost data respecting contractor employees, including a breakdown, by contract, between costs of 'salaries and expenses' and the costs of materials furnished by the contractor; also, that it furnish more accurate figures on the number of contractor employees and provide data which will enable the committee to make comparison between the relative costs of direct hire and contractor services."

Agency comment: To comply with the essence of this recommendation, the Agency has adopted a form entitled "Contract Cost Data" for use by its contracting officers to provide the type of information stated in the recommendation. A breakdown will be obtained by contract between costs of "salaries and expenses," the cost of materials furnished by a contractor, the number of employees contemplated, as well as other information which may prove helpful to AID in future contract administration.

The provision of this information was adopted effective March 1, 1964, since it was considered unfeasible, because of the heavy manpower cost involved, to attempt to retroactively obtain similar information on previous contract actions.

RECOMMENDATION 14

Summary of conclusions: "The Agency employs a host of foreign nationals in various capacities—to support its U.S. employees overseas—there were indications that there was an excess of these employees worldwide."

Recommendation 14: "It is recommended that a review be made of this situation; that the numbers of these local employees be curtailed to the bone; and that the committee be advised within 6 months of the date of this report as to what progress is being made."

Agency comment: The Agency has reviewed its foreign national staffing worldwide and has taken steps to make significant reductions where these can be accomplished without detrimental effect on program operations. By June 30, 1965, AID plans to make substantial reductions in local employment to a level of approximately 9,100 worldwide, a net reduction of almost 700.

RECOMMENDATION 15

Summary of conclusions: "In presenting appropriation requests, the foreign assistance agencies have submitted an administrative budget, covering administrative personnel expenses on which Congress has placed a dollar limitation, while all other employees are classified as program personnel on whom

there is no numerical or fiscal limitation and whose salaries and expenses are paid from development grants for technical assistance. This would appear to be unbusinesslike. It permits an unlimited ceiling on program personnel."

Recommendation 15: "It is recommended that this practice be eliminated; that in the budget presentation for fiscal year 1965, the Agency prepare the regular 'salaries and expenses' budget request required of other agencies; and that the personnel and expenses incident to each major program operated by the Agency be broken down separately."

Agency comment: Examination of this recommendation and the related discussion leads us to the conclusion that adoption of this recommendation in its entirety is impractical and undesirable for the Agency at this time. There are several aspects of the proposal which are involved in this conclusion.

Previous administrations and the Congress have recognized the necessity for administrative flexibility in the execution of the economic assistance program and for this reason have accepted the concept that our congressional presentation is largely illustrative and not firm in its details in the normal budget sense. Manpower, whether direct hire or by contractual arrangement, is only one of the several elements required to execute the programs and projects proposed in the budget, and if flexibility is essential for the total operation, then a similar degree of flexibility would be essential for each of the components. The rigidities inherent in the proposed "salaries and expenses" request argue against adoption of this proposal.

However, in recognition of the need for firm administration of manpower utilization, internal controls, overall personnel, program and administrative, have recently been adopted through the establishment of numerical limitations on direct-hire personnel. These controls are designed to insure the appropriate level and mix of staffing commensurate with the volume and nature of the current program. The fiscal year 1965 congressional presentation includes an exhibit titled "Summary of Total Direct-Hire Personnel Strength." This exhibit shows personnel strength actually onboard at yearend for fiscal year 1963 and established for fiscal year 1964 and 1965. It is designed to provide the user with relevant data regarding administrative and program personnel based on Agency planning.

It would be possible to adopt part of the recommendation by charging the salaries and expenses of program-funded personnel to the appropriation which finances the activities. Under current practices the Agency charges the salaries and expenses of all program-funded personnel to the development grant appropriations regardless of whether the employees' services are required in conjunction with other activities, i.e., development loans or supporting assistance. This practice has been followed because (a) the majority of program-funded personnel has been engaged in technical assistance activities; (b) it was believed that an adequate cost accounting system for the distribution of salaries and expenses to related appropriations would cost more than the results would be worth.

If a cost formula would be acceptable to the General Accounting Office, there would be no objection to the distribution of these charges. In view of the current fiscal year 1965 budget deadlines, however, it seems probable that the fiscal year 1966 budget would offer the first opportunity for proposing this change.

The Agency is continuing its efforts to improve manpower management in compliance with the intent of Congress as expressed in the subject report and on frequent occasions in the past. Moreover, we believe that the strict manpower controls recently adopted by the Agency provide an alternative means

of reaching the objective implicit in the recommendation.

AGENCY COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 7 IN THE REPORT OF SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE ON PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS OF AID

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 said regarding loan terms:

"These subsections effect a major change in the terms and conditions of development loans and the method of financing them. Whereas most of the loans negotiated by the Development Loan Fund have been repayable in local currency, all loans extended under the new authority must be repaid in dollars. Interest rates as low as 1 percent are contemplated, and some loans will probably be interest free. Terms of repayment up to 50 years will be permitted, in some cases with no repayment of principal for initial periods of up to 10 years. The aid agency will have flexibility in establishing terms and conditions that will reflect the capacity of the recipient country to service its debts."

AID policy recognizes that the balance-of-payments prospects of most underdeveloped countries receiving major assistance from AID are such that loan financing on hard terms would severely limit their future abilities to maintain reasonable levels of development imports and therefore prolong and expand future aid requirements. AID established and the National Advisory Council affirmed minimum loan terms involving interest rates of three-fourths percent with up to 40 years to repay and including as much as a 10-year grace period for Foreign Relations Committee as well as in the executive branch presentation, none have actually been made. Likewise, the maximum maturity has been 40 years, rather than the 50 years mentioned in the committee report. Since the ability of a country to repay does not normally change from loan project to loan project, terms are generally the same for all loans to any one country.

AID policy takes into account the differences among countries in ability to repay. For nations that have shown progress in moving toward self-sustaining growth such as Greece, Thailand, Taiwan, and Israel, or those that have relatively good foreign exchange earning capacity such as Mexico, Libya, or Venezuela, terms are harder. The harder terms may be reflected in the interest rate, the length of a grace period, or the duration of the loan.

Even in countries that are eligible for softest terms some AID credits are repaid by borrowers at harder terms. For dealing with projects of a directly revenue-producing nature such as private enterprise and public utilities, procedures are utilized to maintain a normal debt burden on borrowers without unduly aggravating the host country's balance-of-payments difficulties. Thus, in the usual case, a two-step arrangement is concluded between the borrower, the host government, and AID, which provides for repayment by the borrower on normal terms (approximating Export-Import Bank terms) in local currency to the host government, which then will assume the obligation to repay AID in dollars but on terms similar to those which otherwise would be established by AID for direct loans to the Government.

Attached (see attachment) is a list of AID development loans approved through December 1963, at three-fourths percent interest. There were 171 of them. They constituted about nine-tenths of all loans approved during the period. The list includes six loans which, though they carried three-fourths percent interest, had maturities or grace periods shorter than the maximum permitted by the governing policy.

In terms of lending volume, total approvals in the period amounted to about \$2.4 billion. Over \$200 million of this went

at interest rates higher than three-fourths percent. In addition, there were about \$88 million in three-fourths percent loans with maturities or grace periods shorter than the permitted maximum (see 2 per list). Forty loans, included in the 171 at three-fourths percent interest, were two-step loans involving harder terms to the ultimate borrower (see 1 per list). The total amount of these two-step loans was over \$345 million.

Dollar development loans authorized after December 16, 1963, reflect the amendment to section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act adopted by the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Interest during the first 10 years of the loan will be no less than three-fourths percent and no less than 2 percent after the first 10 years. AID will limit maximum loan durations and grace periods on the repayment of principal, as before, to 40 years and 10 years respectively. Harder

terms will be applied to loans to countries with higher debt-servicing capacities. As before, loan terms will also be adjusted for loans for revenue-producing projects with the "two-step" procedure used when needed to impose normal debt burdens on borrowers while protecting the foreign exchange position of the host countries. The congressional presentation for fiscal year 1965 will discuss loan terms for each country for which harder terms are now planned.

Dollar development loans at 3/4-of-1-percent interest approved by AID, November 1961 through December 1963, by region and country

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Loan	Amount	Country total	Country	Loan	Amount	Country total
Argentina	Feasibility studies	3,000	75,800	Cameroon	TransCameroon Railroad	9,200	9,200
	Road program	30,500			3d highway loan	4,000	4,000
	Road project	6,700		Guinea	Electrification	12,400	2,400
	Grain storage	121,700		Ivory Coast	Highway equipment	1,700	1,700
	Housing bank	12,500		Kenya	Nairobi water supply	12,200	2,200
	Animal disease laboratory	1,400					
Bolivia	Customs and warehouse center	2,200	27,000	Liberia	High school	1,700	31,300
	Highway	3,900			Medical center	5,300	
	Access roads	7,200			Hydropower	124,300	
	Feasibility studies	6,000		Mali	Teachers college	2,100	3,200
	El Alto Airport	1,200			Veterinary laboratory	1,100	
	Highway maintenance	400		Niger	Development Bank	500	500
	Agricultural bank	3,700	104,100	Nigeria	Ibadan water supply	12,100	20,700
	Industrial bank	12,400			Calabar-Ikom Road	8,600	
Brazil	Highway project	11,000		Somalia	Port facilities	3,600	3,600
	Feasibility studies	1,500					
	Emergency electric power	2,400		Sudan	Sewage system	3,800	5,800
	Carbon black plant	12,000			Development bank	12,000	
	Development bank	14,000	85,000	Tanganyika	Electrical equipment	300	7,900
	Rubber plant	13,400			Agriculture college	1,250	
	Nonproject	74,500			Community development center	250	
	Electric power	15,300			Teachers college	800	
					University	800	
Chile	Nonproject	35,000	83,500		Water supply	1,300	
	Development bank	40,000			do	2,200	
	Feasibility studies	3,000			Program	1,000	
	San Vicente port	17,000		Tunisia	Agricultural equipment	6,500	35,700
					University of Tunis	1,800	
Colombia	Mineral survey	2,000	17,000		Nonproject	15,000	
	Agricultural credit	10,000			do	10,000	
	Feasibility studies	4,000			Irrigation	1,000	
	Nonproject	60,000			Sfax water supply	600	
	Self-help housing	17,500			Tunis water supply	800	
Costa Rica	Highway program	2,100	2,100	Uganda	Schools	2,400	4,400
	Cachi hydropower	1,500			Development bank	12,000	
	Slum housing	2,000					
	Agriculture bank	15,000		African regional total			132,600
	Water supply	1,400					
Dominican Republic	Industrial bank	15,000		Afghanistan	Airlines	2,625	4,625
	Housing bank	12,100			Transport equipment	2,000	
Ecuador	Feasibility studies	2,000	11,300	United Arab Republic	Cairo powerplant	30,600	
	Industrial expansion	15,000			Grain storage	17,000	
	Highways	2,700			Cardboard plant	15,700	
	Administration reform	1,600			Viscose plant	13,000	
				India	Tarapur power	180,000	56,300
El Salvador	Industrial institute	4,500	15,800		Coal washery	5,100	
	Agricultural loans	8,900			Gear production	12,300	
	School construction	2,400			5th railway loan	15,850	
					Truck plant	113,700	
Guatemala	American school	1700			Hindustan motors	115,800	
Honduras	Rural schools	600	3,700		Trombay power	117,900	
	Water supply	1,050			Rayon plant	19,800	
Jamaica	do	1,500			Development bank	120,000	
	do	2,200			Auto plant expansion	13,000	
Mexico	Agricultural credit	20,000			Chandrapura power	16,000	
Nicaragua	Las Mercedes Airport	1,000	2,440		Nonproject	240,000	
	Highway construction	900			Central ropeway	7,700	
	Schools	540			Satpura power	25,100	
Panama	Water supply and sewage	16,000			Delhi "C" power	16,000	
	Development bank	5,100			Ramagundam power	8,400	
Peru	Feasibility studies	3,000	11,100		Hydropower	20,200	
	Lima water and sewage	8,600			4th railroad loan	43,000	
	Hydroelectric project	12,200			Nonproject	200,000	
	do	12,000			Bandel power	38,000	
					Patherdihm washery	4,200	
Uruguay	Home mortgage bank	16,000	15,800		Cambay power	33,600	
				Iran	Electrification plans	22,400	835,650
Venezuela	Slum clearance	230,000					
	Agricultural credit	10,000		Israel	Nonproject	35,000	45,000
					do	10,000	
CABEI	Feasibility studies	2,500	12,500	Nepal	Industrial Bank	1,000	1,000
	Home loans	10,000					
Latin American regional total			535,490	Pakistan	5th railroad loan	14,500	14,500
					Water and sewage	3,100	
					Consulting services	5,600	
					Sawmill	12,200	

See footnotes at end of table.

CX—1024

Dollar development loans at $\frac{3}{4}$ -of-1-percent interest approved by AID, November 1961 through December 1963, by region and country—
Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Loan	Amount	Country total	Country	Loan	Amount	Country total
Pakistan	Power generation	126,000		Turkey	Nonproject	35,000	
	Public health	1,500			Nylon plant	1,800	
	Nonproject	70,500			Feasibility studies	3,000	
	Salinity control	750			do.	350	
	Consulting	4,400			Power generation	31,300	
	Dacca Airport	4,300			Locomotives	10,000	
	Coastal embankment	6,500			Highway equipment	18,100	
	Feasibility studies	2,000					99,550
	Salinity control	10,800					
	Airport	2,100		Near East and south Asia regional total.			1,433,675
	Chalna anchorage	3,600					
	Nonproject	30,000		China	Nonproject	20,000	
	Malaria	3,800			Telecommunications	5,200	
	Nonproject	42,000					25,200
	4th railroad loan	31,000		Korea	Kunsan power	12,800	
	Dacca-Chittagong power	8,600			Changsong coal mine	9,500	
	Nonproject	45,000			Locomotives	8,300	
	do.	45,000			Pusan power	20,900	
	Mechanical equipment	1,500			Cement plant	14,250	
	Machinery pool	5,000					55,750
	Telecommunications	4,700					
			374,450	Far East regional total.			80,950
Syria	Grain storage	14,700	14,700	Grand total			2,182,715

¹ 2-step loan. Terms to borrower were at higher interest rate.

² Interest at $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 percent. Grace and duration shorter than softest terms.

INCREASED SALARY FOR SENATORS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while the recently enacted salary increase bill was pending before the Congress, there appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Citizen Journal newspaper an editorial entitled, "Prestige? Dignity? Status?"

The views expressed by the writer of this editorial and called to my attention by Mr. Donald L. Patin, research associate of the Ohio State University, concur with my thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESTIGE? DIGNITY? STATUS?

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina and his colleagues of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee have formally recommended that all Senators and Representatives be paid an additional \$7,500 a year.

Their bill, scheduled for Senate action, also provides pay increases for all other Federal employees, judges, congressional help and postmasters. It follows the pattern of the one passed by the House and ups the lawmakers' pay from \$22,500 to \$30,000 a year. (Only 9 years ago Congressmen were paid—and some overpaid—\$15,000 a year.)

The Johnston report argues that the "increasing cost of serving in Washington" is one reason for the pay increase. But no Congressman ever was hogtied and made to take the job.

But when the report says that "also involved (in the proposed pay increase) is the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members," it is indulging in as ridiculous a bit of sophistry as we've ever seen in a congressional report.

Senators should know money won't buy "prestige." If it's "prestige" they want, let them write a law (and obey it) to end congressional conflicts of interest and set up a rigid and honest congressional code of ethics.

If it's "dignity" they want, more pay won't assure it, but an end of nepotism might. Let them seek "dignity" by forcing the end of employment at fat Federal salaries of

wives, sons, daughters, brothers, and in-laws.

And if it's "status" they desire, let them seek it by putting an end to sponging on the Federal Treasury with lush Government-paid junkets disguised as "factfinding" or "investigative" trips, and let them pass an honest "clean elections" law to assure complete and instant disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director of the Community Relations Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on the question of confirmation of the nomination of LeRoy Collins to be Director of the Community Relations Service, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to the confirmation of Gov. LeRoy Collins to head the Community Relations Service, which was established under the recently enacted so-called civil rights bill. I opposed the creation of this new Federal agency when it was before the Senate, and I want to reiterate my opposition at this time. Further, I believe that the past actions and statements of Governor Collins prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that he is not qualified for this position.

On December 3, 1963, Governor Collins made a speech to the annual banquet of the Columbia, S.C., Chamber of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that this speech in its entirety be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this speech, which was carried on a statewide radio and television network, Governor Collins castigated the South, and its elected representatives in particular, in a highly inflammatory and completely unnecessary fashion.

I have asked that this speech be placed in the RECORD in its entirety so that everyone who reads it may draw his own

conclusions concerning what was said by Governor Collins on that occasion. However, I feel there is no room for doubt but that Governor Collins' remarks were so ill-chosen and indicative of a lack of discretion as to make him unfit to head an agency whose ostensible purpose is to cool passions and act as a conciliatory body.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials and statements from South Carolina newspapers, following the address by Governor Collins, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, these editorials show how the people of South Carolina interpreted this speech and how they felt about it. It is generally considered that Governor Collins insulted the people of South Carolina and of the South without cause or justification. As could be expected, newspapers from other sections of the country and even from neighboring States differed in their interpretation of these remarks, but I know of no favorable comments concerning this address from any South Carolina newspaper or individual.

In addition, Mr. President, the events which have occurred since Mr. Collins undertook the tasks of this position show that the Community Relations Service will have little, if any, beneficial effect in attempting to solve any racial problems which may exist in the country. The response of the Governors who have been contacted by Secretary Hodges and Mr. Collins has not been at all favorable. Most of the southern Governors, and most of the communities in the South, would rather be left alone to work out any difficulties with the local people, free from outside interference or intervention of any kind. It seems from all the evidence at hand that the Community Relations Service will serve no useful purpose.

Mr. President, the enforcement of the recently enacted so-called Civil Rights Act will mean the upheaval of social patterns and customs more than a century old in many communities, both in the South and in other areas of the Nation as well. To force people to change their pattern of living overnight, to require them to forget how they have acted and reacted over the entire span of their lifetime, creates a potentially dangerous situation. In many instances the best advice which could be given would be for the integration groups to discontinue their demands and their agitation. And yet, Mr. President, it is clear that the conciliatory advice which will be offered by the nominee as head of the Community Relations Service will be all one sided. The advice will be limited as to how integration can best be achieved, not whether it should be pushed or not. This one-sided advice can in no way be considered conciliatory, and will do little to ease tensions.

Mr. President, the nominee now before the Senate for confirmation has stated within recent months that he is opposed

to racial segregation. He has also stated that he feels that segregation at lunch counters is morally wrong. This attitude seems to be of rather recent origin because when the nominee was the Governor of Florida, he entertained a different point of view. Governor Collins ran for and served as Governor of Florida as a segregationist. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated August 1, 1956, signed by LeRoy Collins, Governor of Florida. I have removed the name of the addressee to avoid embarrassing him. In this letter, Governor Collins wrote:

I have stated repeatedly, of course, that I favor segregation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Tallahassee, August 1, 1956.

DEAR MR. _____: I acknowledge your letter of July 28.

Under a fundamental arrangement of our form of government, the executive has no control over the legislative branch in the way that your letter seems to indicate and I am confident you would not want me to do anything that would violate this principle.

I have stated repeatedly, of course, that I favor segregation and it is my sincere judgment that the program enacted by the Florida Legislature in this special session will be effective.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely,

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the nominee has now changed his viewpoint completely. Governor Collins told the Senate Commerce Committee during its hearings on this nomination that:

I have had an opportunity here in Washington to expand my horizons.

There seems to be a tendency for an individual to do a turnabout when he is no longer responsive to the electorate and he is instead filling an appointed office. I have little respect for turncoats who are willing to sacrifice their previous principles for political expediency. Governor Collins' views are now substantially at variance with those which he publicly held while he was running for and holding an elective office in his native State of Florida.

Being fully knowledgeable of the trend today toward centralization of all powers here in Washington and the erosion of States rights, and being further cognizant of today's practice of catering to the bloc votes, I am under no delusion as to the outcome of the vote which is soon to be taken. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the confirmation of this nominee and want the RECORD to clearly show my opposition.

EXHIBIT 1

ROUT FORCES OF HATE

(Address of LeRoy Collins, president, National Association of Broadcasters, before the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S.C., December 3, 1963)

It is a high privilege for me to be here in Columbia, and to participate in this Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce annual meeting of 1963.

I like South Carolina, and I always have. Yours is a State rich in history and exciting in opportunity.

Your distinguished Governor, Donald Russell, who honors us all by his presence here tonight, is a public leader of conspicuous competence and of uncommon dedication.

I would like to add my warm congratulations to all of your chamber of commerce officers and committees. You have had a remarkably successful year; and, while the rank-and-file support of your membership doubtless has been excellent, special praise is due all who have supplied the leadership.

My message this evening is being carried by many broadcasters here and across this State. I am grateful to them. I also salute them, along with all other broadcasters, for their enormous efforts in reporting to the American people and to the world the story of our Nation in the agony of its trial after the assassination of President Kennedy. As soon as the first dastardly shot was fired in Dallas, response of news broadcasters was immediate. It became complete, and reflected the highest skill and dedication.

This was the free broadcaster at his finest. No one from the Government had to make the slightest move to get him going, or to keep him at his task, or to hold out any hope that his commercial losses would be offset in any way or shared by anyone else. It was his job. And in performing it, he asked not what the country could do for him, but only what he could do for his country.

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and "raising" than I am. I love this land. But some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I think South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

I have tried to be a southerner who speaks plainly on sensitive issues, and you are sons and daughters of a State which, from the time of Sumter and Pickens and Calhoun, has been characterized by forthright debate.

Doubtless as you have detected down the years, a number of people in other neighborhoods of America have not always agreed with the forthright talk emerging from South Carolina. But debate, if it is honest and thoughtful, refines the decisions in our Republic and makes them more intelligent.

I have not come to address old grievances. It is the future of the South and of our Nation I wish to take up with you here tonight. And the one is inseparable from the other.

I would hope first that we might consider as our own the creed of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who, once exasperated by his critics in the Senate when he was the leader of that forum, sought to explain himself in these terms: "I am a freeman, an American, a U.S. Senator and a Democrat, in that order."

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

We also like to speak of the "new, new South," which glitters with projections of future prosperity almost beyond comprehension. And I firmly believe that you and I will see all this come to pass in our lifetimes.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made.

They have done it in speeches on the floor of Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—egged on by the rabble rousers' call to "stand up and fight."

It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners. Violence and disorder will occur anywhere, regardless of the issue, when reason and discussion are allowed to give way to hate and acrimony.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirtwavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward.

The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina.

And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream.

There has been no need for Federal marshals patrolling your university campuses, thanks to the good sense and respect for law among the people of this State.

You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate.

Yes, there are forces at work in the South—men and women who do not have their faces turned backward, stalwart men and women who have not received the headlines and public notices which have been accorded the more sensational examples of lack of progress, but who have been in the vanguard of progress nonetheless.

There is a story which came out of World War I. I do not vouch for its literal accuracy. In fact, there are many reasons for

doubting its truth in detail. But its message rings true.

Three American soldiers—one a Protestant, one a Catholic, and one a Jew—became fast friends as they marched and fought together in France. They entered into a pact committing the survivors to do everything possible for the family of any one of them who might be killed in action.

In a battle soon afterward, on the outskirts of a small French village, the Protestant boy was killed. The only place of worship was a little Catholic church. The Catholic boy and the Jewish boy asked the priest of this little church for permission to have their friend buried in the church cemetery adjoining. But when the priest learned that the dead boy was not Catholic, he regretfully declined, pointing out that under the regulations of the church the cemetery had been established and blessed for the burial of Catholics only.

After considerable discussion of the point, the priest suggested as an alternative that the burial be made just outside the fence of the cemetery and said, "Here we will be sure to see that the grave is cared for and not desecrated, just as faithfully as we care for the graves on the inside."

The arrangement was worked out, and the two boys who survived went on through the war. When peace came, they returned to their homes in the United States.

They had the understanding, however, that 3 years from the date their friend was killed they would meet in the French village and together visit the grave.

When this day came, they met as agreed and soon came to the little church. But when they arrived just outside the fence where they had buried their friend, they were shocked to see no sign of the grave. Angriely, they found the old priest and scolded him for his neglect.

Then the old father took the two young men out into the cemetery and led them down the inside of the fence. There was the grave just as the soldiers had left it. Then he said, "You know, some time after you left, I went back and studied our regulations further. I found it to be very clear that while I was not permitted to allow the burial inside the fence, there was nothing which prevented me from later moving the fence over."

Fellow southerners, we can talk about our mores, our local laws and customs, the low standards of many Negroes, but the time has come where we must move some fences.

The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order or a legislative act. But while courts and laws cannot change the innermost dictates of the human conscience, courts and laws most certainly can control the acts of men.

This task of assuring racial justice is no easy one for us in the South—nor is it for those in the North. But Americans everywhere must recognize that this is a national commitment and a national necessity. It is not going away.

The advancement of all rights of national citizenship, as we well know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government if local citizens and local and State governments do not move effectively to accomplish this on their own.

Yet, too many politicians down our way have been hoodwinking the people on the civil rights issue. They have been trying to pretend, for their own personal political advantage, that the changes which are coming over the hill really are not there. They talk defensively of States rights when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty.

Any rational man who looks at the horizon and sees the South of the future segregated is simply seeing a mirage.

"That all men are created equal" is not an empty cliché. It was not put in our Declaration of Independence by Jefferson merely to stir our revolutionary forces to greater sacrifice.

It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment. It is the basic idea which supports the dignity of man as an individual.

It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force.

It may be thwarted—it may be delayed—its triumph may be at great cost and sacrifice—but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right.

Aside from human attitudes the most basic changes which must occur to aid us in resolving our racial difficulties is the improvement of the standards of living of all underprivileged Americans. The taproot of future progress is greatly expanded and improved public education for all American youngsters.

While in the Florida Legislature many years ago, I undertook the leadership for the passage of legislation known as the minimum foundation program. Under it, the State government guaranteed to every child in Florida, regardless of where he lived or how poor his county, a public education of no less quality than certain prescribed standards. This has worked quite well, and other States have developed similar plans.

There was talk at the time that a program like this would rob local communities of local interest and influence, but this did not turn out to be the case.

Now, I feel that we should mount in this country a massive national minimum foundation plan under which the Nation would assure to every child an education adequate to the full development of his talents.

This would call for the supplementing of local resources in proportion to need. It could enable us to close our educational gap and bring to an end our vicious cycle of ignorance breeding more ignorance with resulting impoverishment of body, intellect, and spirit.

This is not only a national need; I say it is a necessity. We must do this to enable the Nation better to meet its adversaries in a hostile and competitive world. But, more importantly, we must do it to provide for American children a seedbed of simple justice which is now their rightful heritage, although for millions it has not been their inheritance.

Our country has a right to expect the best from all of us, regardless of where we live.

And just as it is wrong for anyone, including some southerners, to sell the South short, by the same token we in the South have no right to go off in a corner and sulk.

Southerners, like Americans from every section of this land, have a solemn obligation to make whatever general and unique contributions they can to the national good.

It is high time the South rid itself of any political inferiority complex.

Leadership in the South—business, professional, educational, and political—instead of being rejected out of hand nationally must be regarded as a valuable resource in the role which America must play in meeting the challenge of history.

Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership. And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy.

After all, where was this Republic founded? By whom were our Nation's principles of freedom and individual dignity hammered out?

So much of this came from the minds of Washington and Jefferson and Henry. The young Republic was nourished by the philosophies of Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Southerners all.

The South should be bright and optimistic, indeed, as we face the future.

To become a more vital part of the Nation's efforts for the fulfillment of national goals will not demean our posture as States, but enhance it. It will not be a retreat, but an advance. It will not be a defeat, but a victory.

My fellow countrymen, a few long days ago our young President was struck down on the street of an American city. Good men have differences, and many Americans had differences with John Kennedy. But I do not know of any fellow countryman who, after rendezvousing with his soul, would not share the sweet dream of John Kennedy for a better America or his dedication to move his dreams toward reality. He was the unusual, heroic person in politics who thought not in terms of years, but in terms of generations and of what America must be for our children and the children of our children.

Just a few days before his death, President Kennedy was talking to one of our leading southern editors—a very close friend—William Bagges of the Miami News, about the year A.D. 2000 and of what we, in our generation, must plant and plow up to make this country right for its sons and daughters in A.D. 2000.

I say to you tonight that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet.

This has not been anything like the speech that I first expected to make here.

But the other day, as I followed the caisson drawn by the six white horses to Arlington's green hillside and listened to the bugler's mournful cry and saw the flame lighted on the grave as if to hold back at least a tiny part of the approaching darkness, my conscience grew heavy with the long promise of history:

"Beyond the sundown is tomorrow's wisdom; Today is going to be a long, long ago."

Oh, God of all mankind, help us to find that wisdom. Help us to make today count for more than its sorrows.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Dec. 4, 1963]

THE COLLINS SPEECH IN COLUMBIA

There is the account of the speech of former Governor Collins in Columbia yesterday with bold heading on the front page of this morning's paper. Too much of the speech is untruth, and on the whole it is a misrepresentation spoken in the face of southern people.

Mr. Collins is now president of the National Association of Broadcasters whose monopoly for propaganda is today the most powerful single voice in the country. Whether it is used with the best taste, in the best national interest, is questionable, but it and its president are adept at propaganda.

The building of a new world through the airways engages much of the time of Mr. Collins, one may be sure. Not content with visiting the homes of the South through remote broadcast of entertainment, he comes into the Deep South to the capital of the Secession State, to preach against the South's evil, which he says is segregation.

It is typical and unfortunate that as men move into positions of power they lose something of the values that made them what they were, but are no longer.

The greatest power is not always at the top, and that is why centralization, seeking perfection in the whole, is bereft of the means of achieving it.

Dictatorship may have many good reasons for acceptance, but it has been historically true that dictatorship and the ultimate

ideals of good have been two separate and distinct things.

People naturally and historically resent intrusion; for there is no absolute power except in the conscience of the individual, and there is no power to be respected above one's own convictions.

Mr. Collins has been drawn into the central establishment of power in the United States, which assumes that it can engineer a new social order from the top.

The baptism of power is often fatal; and, in a country of liberty, it is only power that can destroy it. Mr. Collins, who blames the South for the assassination of President Kennedy, would deny criticism, opposition, the spoken and written word, it seems. He would deny the very freedoms that are conscienceful forces in our country dedicated to maintaining our freedoms.

Destroy them, and the well of liberty has gone dry.

Years ago in the days of steam pumps, an engineer was being examined for graduation, when his examiner proposed the following question: "Suppose you have a steam pump constructed for a ship, under your own supervision, and know that everything is in perfect working order yet, when you throw out the hose, it will not draw. What would you think?"

"I should think, sir, there should be a defect somewhere."

"But such a conclusion is not admissible, for the supposition is, that everything is perfect, and yet it will not work."

"Then, sir, I should look over the side to see if the river had run dry."

Those who stand in positions of power inevitably want to create a perfect machine, which now in contemplation is a new world order without freedom.

When, along the way, will they learn that no matter how perfect the machine is designed, the river of liberty, which is life itself, is to be reckoned with, too?

One must agree with Mr. Collins that politicians have misled the people into believing that the public law in time will uphold segregation. Segregation will never be a public ideal. It is a private, personal matter, embraced by freedom, but not by the law.

The idea that men are created equal, he said, "is an idea that can never be stopped, not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force * * * has the invincibility of simple truth, justice and right."

With all that most southerners agree, and anyone of heart and reason must ever wish that it will be so. It is a great ideal.

But there is no known order, in all history, no system of government, no man-made laws, no army bayonet, no appropriation of funds, or anything else that can be done to bring about equality without first the complete destruction of freedom; for ultimate equality is an ideal of freedom, not of power.

And, while so many leaders talk of advancing the cause of humanity, of moving forward in social and economic fields—all of which sounds so promising and so winning—they seldom say that a dictatorship could get it all done quickly and easily; but that is what they would say, if they wanted to be truthful all the way, which Mr. Collins has not been. But he did say this—thanks to his frankness—"The advancement of all rights * * * as we know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government."

And, all the while, the power establishment softens its approach to the dictators of the world who are committed to bury us all, and to whom freedom is the sinister evil.

In the power establishment—closely supported by the National Association of Broadcasters—the leaders, the public casually observes, are nearly all millionaires or very rich; and this is so on nearly all leadership levels, the wealth of government having its

courtiers now as it did in the early days of royalty.

It becomes importunate that they gather before humanity a set of ideals attractive to the masses, and that they crusade to justify their power and good fortune, to soothe their conscience, to seem to supply a high service and thus to further their own interest—to accomplish what they would like to be given credit for but are not competent either to conceive or to administer.

And like the infallible kings of old, while what they say is a form of power itself, they themselves contribute almost nothing. Like the royalty of ancient times, their work consists of spending money taken from the pockets of the people.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE COLLINS INSULT

Besides insulting millions of southerners with public blame for President Kennedy's murder, former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, managed in his speech at Columbia to work in a specific insult to a southern family by the name of Claghorn.

The late Fred Allen, one of the greatest American comics of our time, invented a character with a southern accent and called him Senator Claghorn. Members of the Claghorn clan may not have liked this use of the name but at least they could enjoy Mr. Allen's harmless humor.

The venom in Mr. Collins' barb about "these Claghorns"—whom he linked with several murders, including Mr. Kennedy's—is something altogether different. At least one descendant of a Claghorn—a name with an honorable record in American history—has already expressed the resentment that we are confident is spreading throughout this region. Mrs. B. Ellis deTreville, of Beaufort, whose mother was a Claghorn, has said she intends to sue Mr. Collins unless he makes a public apology.

We wish it were possible for every affronted southerner whatever his name and ancestry, to extract an apology from the man, through we are not prepared to say what it would be worth.

[From the Greenville News, Dec. 6, 1963]

LEROY COLLINS' GRIEVOUS ERRORS

We feel for the hosts at the annual meeting of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and, especially for Gov. Donald S. Russell, who was called upon to introduce former Gov. LeRoy Collins of Florida prior to his speech in which he denounced in terms at least as vicious as its most extreme critics have used his native South.

When he declared that "Dixie battlecries which incite sick souls to violence" fostered or contributed to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the once politically ambitious Floridian not only libeled the South but the whole Nation.

For the things he said of his own region could be said with just as much truth—or the lack of it—of any other region or of the country as a whole.

We shall not waste time taking Governor Collins' remarks apart and dignifying and further broadcasting them by refuting them. But when he spoke in the most extreme terms of the behavior of what he referred to as a few southern extremists, he committed the selfsame sin of which he was accusing them.

Nothing can be said by us or anyone else to excuse or mitigate some of the bombings, shootings, and other crimes to which Mr. Collins referred in the course of his remarks. But he spoke as if this occurred only in the South, and he certainly knows better than that.

The South has its sick souls, of course. But they are about equally divided between the two extremes on the race issue, which

Collins attempted to say was the main cause if not the whole cause of the assassination. The available evidence does not support that thesis.

And, as for the incitement of the sick souls, the kind of man who killed the late John Kennedy is capable of killing anyone for the same paranoid reasons. In fact they don't need any reasons.

The flames of incitement are already burning within their troubled hearts and twisted minds.

Mr. Collins should know that every region and every community in the country has its potential paranoid assassins. They strike often, except that their victims are lesser folk than Presidents and we call it murder instead of an assassination.

Mr. Collins has committed two grievous errors in addition to embarrassing his hosts.

One is that, like certain others, he had attempted to indict unfairly a whole people for the crime of one man or one small group of men.

The other has to do with the old adage that it's a pretty sorry bird who will foul his own nest.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Dec. 5, 1963]

THE MAN WHO CAME TO DINNER

Agree or disagree with LeRoy Collins, you must give him credit for consistency if not for propriety.

The former Governor of Florida long has wanted to remake the image of the South into something more nearly resembling that of the rest of the Nation. His efforts in that direction were apparent when he was the chairman of the southern Governors' Conference—and when he was the presiding chairman over the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

Now that he is president of the National Association of Broadcasters, he carries the same uncharitable view of many things and many people of the South. That is his privilege, and we would be the last to stand in his way of sounding off.

But it seemed singularly inappropriate for him to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to castigate the South and its spokesmen. We accept, with somewhat qualified gratitude, his differentiation of South Carolina from our sister Southern States. We cannot accept his more general indictment of the South.

Least of all can we accept from him or anyone else the accusation that southerners are "un-American" in their adherence to values and traditions which have their very origins in the birth of this Nation of ours.

And for him to impute some sort of collective guilt to the South for the assassination of President Kennedy is both inexcusable and insulting.

If he is genuinely concerned with madmen and meanness, he need only look about in the northern region where he now resides.

The greatest service LeRoy Collins could render the South, and indeed the Nation, would be to use his considerable influence in the world of network broadcasting to throttle those false messiahs of the microphone who glory in misrepresenting all that is decent in Dixie.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,
Dec. 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR COLLINS' SPEECH

"A Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate," the former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, declared in a Columbia speech Tuesday night.

Nor do southerners have to soak themselves in the oil of guilt and set themselves

afire for distant hordes of Saracens to applaud.

Donning the sackcloth of the apologist, he addressed the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce on "some thoughts that have been brooding in my mind lately. I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States," he declared. Then, with his customary urbane eloquence, he proceeded to sharpen the lines of misunderstanding and condemnation.

"For too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it," he said. He might have added, "And too often do the South's own best friends speak against it."

"We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South," the former Governor, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, continued. "They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region * * *. And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?"

The distortion will continue as long as these extremists, these Claghorns, are the only prosouthern voices to which the national press and Governor Collins' own national broadcasters will listen.

The speaker deplored, "Dixie battle cries [that] have been employed to incite sick souls to violence," but he ignored the sources of much of the incitement and preaching of hate which are neither Claghorn nor southern.

"How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?" Governor Collins asked, compounding the reckless libel that crime and lawlessness are a hallmark of southern society.

"It is time the decent people of the South, with all their might and strength," he added, "told the bloody-shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry." And they should speak loudly enough to be heard afar in the unholy sanctums of intolerance and prejudiced ignorance.

"Too many politicians down our way," the top broadcaster said, "talk defensively of 'States rights' when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a States right to default on a national duty." One of the indictments against the South by those who confuse "national duty" with personal ideology is that the South is too American, too patriotic. Where true national duty has been concerned, the people of Dixie have always stood in the forefront and provided a shield against those who would destroy our national character and heritage. They have observed no conflict between loyalty to State and loyalty to Nation.

"Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership," the speaker declared in his conclusion, "And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy."

Yes, Governor, there certainly are.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

BYRNES TAKES ISSUE WITH COLLINS SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is reprinted from the Columbia State.)

James F. Byrnes, in a statement Friday, charged that "if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate it has been the broadcasters."

Mr. Byrnes, former Governor of South Carolina, and Secretary of State, was taking issue with LeRoy Collins, ex-Governor of Florida, who in a Columbia address attributed hate to the South and racial prejudices. Collins is president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The firing last summer on a Citadel cadet by a young Negro, and the subsequent shot at that institution's president, Gen. Mark Clark, was cited by Mr. Byrnes. "No broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate," he declared.

Mr. Byrnes refuted the idea that Lee Harvey Oswald was motivated by racial feeling in the killing of President Kennedy. "On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government," Mr. Byrnes said.

Following is the text of the statement of Mr. Byrnes:

"Everybody will agree that there should not be developed in any community, or in the country at large, a climate of hatred for an individual or group because of differences in views about political issues. However, Mr. LeRoy Collins spent his time emphasizing that the climate of hate was built up in Birmingham and other southern spots because of race hatred and race prejudices.

"The fact is, in all the thousands of words written about the assassination of President Kennedy, not one witness has offered a statement indicating even that Oswald was motivated by any feeling on the race question. On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government which caused him to try to become a citizen of that country and caused him to go to the trouble and expense of advocating Fair Play for Cuba.

"In addition, it is noteworthy that when asked about counsel to represent him, he stated he did not want any Texas lawyer but that he would like to have Mr. Abt, of New York, who first came into public view as a close friend of Alger Hiss and who has been the subject of investigation by some Government agencies.

"Oswald was young. He could not have personally known Abt. His immediately expressed desire to have this lawyer represent him would indicate that he has knowledge of and probably has sympathy with the man who, like Hiss and Lee Pressman, have been active in the causes sympathetic with the Communists.

"The truth is, if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate, it has been the broadcasters, because they have consistently misrepresented the South and a people who are misrepresented necessarily resent such treatment.

"The press carried a statement last summer that a Citadel cadet while driving a young lady home from a dance at the Citadel, was fired upon by a young Negro. The bullet entered his jaw and was removed from his chin. No broadcaster talked about that being due to the climate of hate that was built up.

"Within 48 hours after that incident, Gen. Mark Clark, a distinguished general in the U.S. Army and a hero of the attempted assassination driving to the Citadel was fired upon. The bullet struck his car but fortunately he was not hurt. The press carried a statement of the attempted assassination but so far as we can recall, no broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate.

"When Oswald, who admittedly is a Communist sympathizer, and who gave the hammer and sickle salute (clenched fist) in the Dallas jail, killed the President of the United States, his act is attributed by Mr. Collins, to a climate of hate growing out of race prejudice."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

ORANGEBURG STATION RAPS COLLINS SPEECH

ORANGEBURG.—Radio station WDX here yesterday took issue with a speech made by former Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

The editorial stated that Mr. Collins said many extreme and radical things but used the time to comment on only one point made by the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Mr. Collins said: "The assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.'"

The full text of the editorial follows:

"Speaker at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia (S.C.) Chamber of Commerce was the Honorable Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida and now the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. The Associated Press reports the broadcasters' president as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' The broadcasters' president said many other extreme and radical things—intolerant and violent things. We will observe only the one thing—that Dixie battle cries fostered the assassination of President Kennedy.

"What Mr. Collins said was equally well said by the three top officers of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Gus Hall, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Benjamin J. Davis—also reported by the Associated Press that they 'called the President's assassination "the ultimate end * * * by the racists and forces of the ultraright,"' the Communist Party, U.S.A. What the Honorable Mr. Collins said and what the top Reds in the United States said, has also been said by the Communist news agency, Tass, since their first release on President Kennedy's death. The Honorable Mr. Collins, it must be noted, is joined by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Communists, in a similar view. That is the privilege of Chief Justice Warren and the Communists and the Honorable Mr. Collins—to smear the South, the segregationists, and 'unnamed southern politicians' who advocate States rights.

"Thank goodness, not all responsible people—like the Honorable Mr. Collins—align themselves in the manner he has. For instance, in referring to Supreme Court Justice Warren's statement about the 'forces of hatred and malevolence,' the Chicago Tribune said: 'This perverted thesis may be reduced to an attempt, naked and without apology, to liquidate dissent in the United States.'"

STATEMENT OF WALTER J. BROWN, PRESIDENT OF SPARTAN RADIOCASTING CO. AND FORMER PRESIDENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

It was "inappropriate," to use the words of the Columbia State, for Governor Collins to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to "castigate the South and its spokesmen."

As a broadcaster, I go further and say Governor Collins broke faith with those of us who broadcast his speech when, without warning, he chose the occasion to impugn the motives of most southern leaders over a statewide broadcast which had been set with the written commitment that "Governor Collins will deal with the Government threat to the broadcasting industry."

In fairness to Governor Collins, it should be said that late in the afternoon he released his speech to news media, and Senator Russell, having seen an advance copy, had the opportunity in his introduction to issue a disclaimer, but the broadcasting stations carrying the broadcast had no such opportunity.

What I resented most about the Governor's speech was his attempt to link opposition to the so-called civil rights program to the

tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Everyone knows he was killed by a known Communist and Castro sympathizer. It is so unfair for anyone, whether he be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court or president of the National Association of Broadcasters, to contend that opposition by the people of the South or any other section to far-reaching proposals of the civil rights program pending in the Congress was in any way responsible for the trigger that was pulled in Dallas which took the President's life.

No one certainly would want to take from Governor Collins the right to say what he pleases about any subject at any time. However, he is the paid and recognized spokesman for broadcasters. When he makes a blanket indictment against the people of the South and a vast majority of their duly elected Members of Congress, we feel he oversteps his authority and does a disservice to broadcasting.

If Governor Collins wants to come South and talk about "Claghorns," "bloody-shirt wavers," and riders of "buckboards of bigotry," he should name names. At least this would enable those of us who broadcast his speech to offer equal time.

I know personally most of the southern leaders in Congress, as well as many of our southern Governors. We may not agree with them on all subjects, but none of them falls under the Governor's indictment.

I realize there is a hysteria sweeping the country about civil rights. Perhaps Governor Collins was swept away by this emotional virus when he came to Columbia. But as one broadcaster, I agree with Senator RUSSELL that this civil rights program takes away more liberty than it gives. It deserves calm and deliberate legislative consideration. Governor Collins made no contribution to that end, and he made it difficult for those of us who agreed to serve with him in promoting better relations in the Congress for the worthwhile legislative objectives of our association.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking for the two Senators from the State of Florida, I wish to express our very strong endorsement of the nominee, former Gov. LeRoy Collins of Florida, for this important post.

I hardly think it necessary for me to state for the RECORD that my own position with reference to the Civil Rights Act was to oppose it in every way that I could. That statement goes also for my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS].

However, the fact is that now we have a law. Included in the various provisions of that law is the community relations title, which, to my way of thinking, offers perhaps the greatest opportunity for any possible advancement under the civil rights effort.

The community relations title deals with the subject of conciliation, the matter of adjustments, the effort to establish friendly relations, the bringing of critical racial situations to an end in communities where they may exist, and the warding off of difficult community racial disturbances where they are threatened. For such a post, I feel that Governor Collins is uniquely qualified. He has made an outstanding record as a public servant.

He was a member of the House of Representatives of the Florida Legislature when I first became a member of the Florida Senate. I found him to be an able, intelligent, aggressive, distinguished public servant. Later he served in the State senate. A part of that time

I had the honor to serve as Governor, and I had the opportunity to observe him closely. He served in the State senate with distinction.

From there he went into the Second World War as a Navy officer, where he also served ably and with distinction.

He then became Governor of our State, being the first Governor to serve 6 years in that office, 2 years to round out the elective term of the late lamented Dan McCarty and 4 years upon reelection for a term of his own. That his term was both successful and widely recognized is best shown by the fact that he served as chairman of the southern Governors conference and also as chairman of the national Governors conference.

Later he served as chairman of the Democratic Convention at Los Angeles, in 1960. I am sure that most Senators will recall that he served there with ability, fairness, and distinction.

For a number of years he has been the head of the National Association of Broadcasters. All of us know that he has not hesitated to take positions there which he thought were for the advancement of that great industry, even though sometimes those positions were not uniformly popular with the industry which he served. He has resigned his post as president of the National Association of Broadcasters in order to accept this post as head of what I prefer to call the conciliation service, or as it is called in the act, the Community Relations Service. To me, that sacrifice indicated strong dedication. Governor Collins felt that he had a duty and a challenge which he could not fail to meet. I honor him for meeting that challenge. I feel certain that he will perform that duty with signal honor and satisfaction to himself, to the President who appointed him, and to the whole Nation.

I am sure Governor Collins knows better than any of us that his new post will not be an easy one in which to serve; that it will be a post from which will arise frequent difficulties and controversies. Yet he has accepted the challenge to attempt to solve the extremely difficult matters which must arise during the administration of the recently passed Civil Rights Act.

I have received some letters asking me why it is that the Florida Senators who opposed the Civil Rights Act now find it possible to support strongly the nomination of Governor Collins. I have answered them all by saying that I did not expect the President, the appointing authority, to name one who, like myself, had opposed the act in every way that he could, but rather to find someone who, in general support of the act, nevertheless is a southerner, born and bred, knowing the great difficulties which have already beset us and which will arise as the act is being administered. I am sure that Governor Collins, bringing to the task, as he does, a ripe experience in the administration of law, and bringing also his knowledge of race relations in the South in a superlative way, because, as a southern boy, he has served in all the administrative positions I have mentioned, as well as legislative positions, has certainly found

out how difficult is the problem of race relations in the southland, which I am sure he loves as do the two Senators from Florida.

I strongly endorse the nomination of Governor Collins and hope that it will be overwhelmingly approved. I wish Governor Collins well in the very difficult task which he is undertaking at such great sacrifice to himself. I am sure that all the people of the Nation, regardless of what may be their position on this particular vote, will join in hoping that Governor Collins may make a great contribution to the solution of the problems which will arise between the members of the two races during the administration of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida apropos the nomination of Gov. LeRoy Collins to the post to which he has been nominated by the President and approved by the Committee on Commerce.

I wish especially to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other of his colleagues, including the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. WALTERS], the distinguished Senators from Arkansas [Mr. MCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the other members of the so-called southern bloc, for the statesmanship they have shown since the passage of the Civil Rights Act and for the advice which they have given publicly, indicating that we operate under a government of laws, not a government of men.

These Senators fought hard and vigorously against the passage of the bill; but as true Americans and great statesmen, they faced the reality. They are doing the same when they consider the nomination of a man of the caliber of LeRoy Collins for the appointment to which the President has designated him.

I add my words of praise for the nomination, and I compliment all Senators who opposed the civil rights bill but who have conducted themselves so admirably since its passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate those warm, gracious words, coming from our great majority leader. I assure him, as I have already stated in the RECORD, that I feel he will be proud in the future of the contributions toward racial peace and understanding that will be made by this appointee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I commend President Johnson for his selection of Governor Collins. I commend Governor Col-

lins for accepting the appointment. No better man could have been chosen. We all know that he accepts the post at great personal sacrifice. It is indeed a public service. I know of no one who is more capable of performing this service in the manner we all desire.

The choice of Governor Collins is an excellent one. I know that I shall be as glad to cast my vote in confirmation of his nomination on the floor of the Senate today as I was in committee earlier.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. No greater tribute could be paid to LeRoy Collins than the tribute we have just heard so eloquently expressed by the Senator who knows him best, our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

I am a member of the Commerce Committee, which had the responsibility of passing upon the confirmation of this nomination.

I did not know LeRoy Collins until 1960, when he officiated as chairman at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications I came to know him very, very well. Since then LeRoy Collins was president of the National Association of Broadcasters, and I therefore came in almost daily contact with this distinguished public servant.

I have always found LeRoy Collins to be fair under all circumstances—judicious—with a deep sense of public service and official responsibility. It is reassuring to all of us that the President of the United States, having to make this appointment under the law, has been able to command the services of LeRoy Collins. I know of no man who is better qualified to perform this demanding service, in the interests of this country, and in the interest of all mankind.

I hope that the Senate will confirm the nomination overwhelmingly, not only because this man deserves the accolade from the Senate, but also because we are fortunate to have a man of his quality and caliber to perform such a sensitive task, which needs to be done in connection with an issue which is fraught with great emotion, and potential misunderstanding.

No man in the United States understands this problem better than does Governor Collins.

No man can perform the task better than Governor Collins.

I applaud the President of the United States for choosing this man; and I urge his confirmation by the Senate in an overwhelming vote as the cause and Governor Collins deserve.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As one who differed with the distinguished Senator from Florida for some 83 days with reference

to the issue of civil rights, I am happy to agree with him in the characterization which he has made of the very fine selection by our President of LeRoy Collins to head the Community Relations Service. The Community Relations Service established under the act has an opportunity to render an outstanding service in easing racial tensions and making the act operative without untoward incident.

In that effort, I do know of Governor Collins' courage, his intelligence, and his dedication to public service will be invaluable. I know him to be a fine man in every sense of the word. I believe that he is deserving of our support on this vote for confirmation, and I shall be happy to support him. I compliment the President on this selection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate those kindly words from the Senator from New York, as I do those from the Senator from Rhode Island, both of whom have had unusual opportunities, because of their committee assignments, to see the type of fair, just, and courageous service which Governor Collins has performed in a highly difficult post of public relations.

Mr. President, unless other Senators wish me to yield, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from

Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 471 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Aiken	Hayden	Neuberger
Allott	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bartlett	Holland	Pearson
Beall	Hruska	Pell
Boggs	Jackson	Prouty
Burdick	Keating	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Carlson	Lausche	Simpson
Case	Mansfield	Smith
Church	McCarthy	Symington
Dirksen	McGee	Talmadge
Dodd	McGovern	Tower
Douglas	McIntyre	Walters
Ellender	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Fong	Monroney	Yarborough
Fulbright	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Moss	

NAYS—8

Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Hill	Robertson	Thurmond
Johnston	Sparkman	

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson	Engle	Magnuson
Bayh	Ervin	Mecham
Bennett	Goldwater	Metcalfe
Bible	Gruening	Miller
Brewster	Hart	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Muskie
Cannon	Inouye	Nelson
Clark	Javits	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kennedy	Scott
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Edmondson	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the routine nominations at the desk, reported from the Committee on Armed Services, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations reported from the Committee on Armed Services and lying on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

CERTAIN DIPLOMATIC NOMINATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Republic; Miss Margaret Joy Tibbetts, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Norway; Winthrop G. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days after their receipt in the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside

and that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1108, and following measures on the calendar, and that at the appropriate places in the discussion of the bills, which have been cleared by the leadership on both sides, proper insertions and explanations may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the following measures were considered and acted upon as indicated:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS JURISDICTION FOR CLAIM OF SARPY COUNTY, NEBR.

The bill (S. 2339) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Sarpy County, Nebraska, arising out of the closing of the north-south county road connecting Bellevue and La Platte to make way for the principal east-west runway at Offutt Air Force Base, in said county.

Sec. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such Court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1170), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to enable Sarpy County, Nebr., to file a lawsuit against the United States based upon the closing of portions of two roads to make way for a runway at Offutt Air Force Base. Jurisdiction would be conferred notwithstanding any laches, or statutes of limitations, or other bar to filing suit against the United States, provided such suit is instituted within 1 year after enactment of the measure.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, considers the merits of S. 2339 to be a matter primarily for the equitable consideration of the Congress.

The facts of the case are set out in the report of the Department of the Air Force as follows:

"In 1954 it became necessary to close portions of two secondary public roads lying

within the area required for the Air Force runway extension project. The underlying fee title to the roads is vested in the United States, subject to the usual road easements. A detailed study of the effect of this road closing was made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which disclosed: (1) there remained only approximately 15 dwellings served by the roads which were closed, (2) a representative traffic count showed an average of only 12 vehicles in a 24-hour period, and (3) there were adequate alternate routes available to serve the same areas. As a result, it was the conclusion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that there was no necessity to provide substitute facilities. Subsequently, the Bureau of Public Roads conducted an independent survey of this road situation which further confirmed the opinion of the Department of the Army.

"A considerable time after the roads were barricaded, the Sarpy County commissioners requested the United States to construct a road where none existed to connect with an existing road which extends into the town of Bellevue. This proposal would entail construction of approximately 2 miles of road and a bridge across Papillion Creek. This proposed road would serve an area located a considerable distance from the area served by the closed roads. Thus, the new road would serve different people in a different area for a different purpose than that previously served by the closed roads.

"Justification for any replacement road is based on the need of the traveling public at the time. U.S. Highway 73-75 and Nebraska State Highway 31 provided, and still provide, adequate travel facilities to Bellevue for the people who were previously served by the closed roads. In 1955 the Air Force contributed \$17,000 for the construction of an interchange access connection in support of Highway 73-75. In addition, the Air Force contributed \$278,000, under fiscal year 1962 access roads program, for the improvement of East road, located east of the base, which extends in a north-south direction connecting with the southern boundary of Bellevue.

"It is a well-established principle of law that a State or other public entity is entitled to compensation for the permanent closure of a public highway only to the extent that as a result of such closure it is compelled to construct a substitute highway. Where it has been determined that a substitute road is not required, the courts have held that no compensation is required for the extinguishment of the public's right in the road easements. While Sarpy County did not seek a judicial determination at the time the roads were closed, it is reasonable to assume that had such action been taken, this same principle would have applied. While construction of the new road in the location proposed by the county would be of assistance to the undeveloped area south of Papillion Creek, it cannot properly be considered as a substitute for the roads that were closed.

"It is the normal policy of the Corps of Engineers to recommend the initiation of condemnation proceedings where no agreement can be reached between the Government and a State or local governmental agency as to the necessity for replacement roads. This procedure affords the Federal Government and the State or local governmental agency the opportunity to have the question of the need for replacement road facilities judicially determined. In this instance, the Federal Government did not initiate condemnation proceedings because extended negotiations between the county and the Government and studies conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads led all concerned to believe that agreement could be reached without court action.

"Since the opinions of the respective parties could not be reconciled and the Federal Government did not file a condemnation proceeding, the only remedy of the county commissioners was to have instituted a suit

against the United States in the U.S. Court of Claims pursuant to the so-called Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. 1491); such suit, however, must be brought within 6 years of the accrual of the claim (28 U.S.C. 2501). In the instant case, by reason of the lapse of time, the right of the county to bring such suit is barred. The bill, S. 2339, would in effect waive this limitation and permit the county 1 year from enactment of this act to sue the United States."

The report of the Department of the Air Force to the chairman of the committee appears to contain certain conclusions of fact and interpretations of law which are disputed by the beneficiary of the bill (S. 2339) Sarpy County, Nebr. The committee notes that the sole purpose of this legislation is to confer on the U.S. Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and determine the facts and render judgment thereon. Attempts to pre-judge either the facts or law in this case clearly are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the bill and the committee wishes to completely disassociate itself from any such effort.

It is normal procedure for the Government to file condemnation proceedings and thus giving a county such as Sarpy County, Nebr., its opportunity to be reimbursed for the fair market value for the "taking." If the Government does not condemn, the only remedy for the county is to institute a suit against the United States in the U.S. Court of Claims pursuant to the so-called Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. 1491).

The facts in this case were unusual. The Government did not take the county roads by condemnation but in effect took them by seizing possession. The Government then instituted negotiations with the county, which negotiations collapsed. During the period of negotiations, the time for filing suit by the county expired. The committee believes under these circumstances that the county should be afforded its day in court and therefore recommends favorable enactment of the bill S. 2339.

KANSAS JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN STATE HIGHWAYS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2369) to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after "1868", to strike out "which now remains within the boundaries of said Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and Leavenworth Penitentiary lands and" and insert "(15 Stat. 238), which remains United States Government property,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Kansas by the United States exclusive jurisdiction over all of the following described areas bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth:

A strip of land one hundred feet in width along the southern boundary of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation, and along the southern boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands being that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation donated for exclusive use as a public road by Act of Congress approved July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 238), which remains United States Government property, being a part of State Highways Numbered 92 and 7, the highway

numbered United States 73, and the public road known as Mount Zion Road;

Also, a strip of land one hundred feet in width being fifty feet on each side of the centerline of the highway numbered United States 73 and State Highway Numbered 7 extending from the north boundary of the above described one hundred-foot strip northwesterly to the point of intersection of the centerline of said highway with the westerly boundary of said Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation;

Also, that portion of the right-of-way of the public road known as Mount Zion Road which extends in a northwesterly direction along the southwesterly boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands.

Sec. 2. The retrocession of exclusive jurisdiction provided by this Act shall take effect upon acceptance by the State of Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1181), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The enactment of this measure into law will retrocede to the State of Kansas by the United States exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation is located on the Missouri River in Leavenworth County, Kans. It was originally established in 1827 on public domain lands, was subsequently expanded by the acquisition of small areas of privately owned lands, and currently comprises 5,971 acres. The area of the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth affected by this legislation abuts Fort Leavenworth on the south. By virtue of various legislative acts of the State of Kansas, the United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over the lands of both installations. The above areas are traversed or bordered by segments of State Highways 92 and 7, U.S. Highway 73, and Mount Zion Road. These highways are heavily traveled, were constructed by the State, are maintained by the State, and until recently were policed by State and municipal authorities. In September 1961, however, a local court ruled that neither the State nor its municipalities had jurisdiction over those portions of State highways within the boundaries of Federal installations. This, of course, has resulted in a serious disruption of law enforcement and the Federal authorities are unequipped to properly police these roads. The purpose of this bill, therefore, is to remedy the problem through a formal retrocession of jurisdiction by the Federal Government to State authorities. The retrocession of exclusive jurisdiction will take effect upon acceptance by the State of Kansas.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND IN MASSACHUSETTS

The bill (H.R. 393) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 1182), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 393 is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands located within the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This measure if enacted into law will grant general authority to the Secretary of the Army to retrocede such legislative jurisdiction as he deems necessary within the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass. The language of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives is in accordance with the suggestion of the Department of the Army, and is identical with previous enactments on the subject with respect to other military reservations such as Fort Sheridan, Ill., Fort Hancock, N.J., Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., and the Naval Supply Depot, Ogden, Utah. It is likewise in keeping with the position of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States.

At issue at the moment is the question of jurisdiction over 3.6 acres of land comprising a portion of a public road. The Fort Devens Military Reservation was established in 1917 in Middlesex and Worcester Counties, near the town of Ayer, Mass., and currently embraces approximately 10,163 acres of Government-owned land. The United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over these lands by virtue of several acts of cession of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The road referred to is a portion of public highway known as Shirley-Ayer Road, which traverses the northly section of Fort Devens; it is a 50-foot-wide strip about 0.6 mile in length; it is also considered a portion of West Main Street of the town of Ayer. For many years there has been a difference of opinion as to the legislative jurisdiction over this road. The Justice of the First District Court of Northern Middlesex County has steadfastly contended that the United States acquired the underlying fee title and exclusive jurisdiction; the military authorities have been equally firm in their opinion that the Federal Government is not the fee owner, and irrespective of ownership, legislative jurisdiction still remains in the Commonwealth. By reason that both the Commonwealth and the United States contend, respectively, that jurisdiction is in the other party, there is very little law enforcement on subject roadway. The retrocession of jurisdiction to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts herein proposed would rectify this situation.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF ST. PAUL OF CERTAIN LAND IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

The bill (H.R. 4177) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 1183), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 4177 is to direct the Secretary of the Army to grant to the city of St. Paul, Minn., a release of certain reservations and conditions contained in a deed from the United States to the city of St. Paul dated July 5, 1928, covering a small parcel of land within the city of St. Paul, entered into pursuant to the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 956); the release is to be conditioned upon the payment of the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal. Senator McCARTHY introduced an identical bill in the Senate (S. 799).

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The property involved comprises 15,500 square feet of land described as lot 3 and part of lot 4 in block 31 of the plat of St. Paul proper. It was part of the military reservation originally known as the St. Paul Quartermaster and Commissary Depot situated within the city of St. Paul, Minn., and was acquired without cost by the United States from the city of St. Paul by deed dated August 19, 1882. The act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 956), authorized and directed the Secretary of War to convey to the city of St. Paul this property upon payment of \$34,750. This amount was considered to be the fair market value. In compliance with this act the Secretary of War on July 5, 1928, executed a deed conveying said property to the city subject to the following reverter clause:

"Provided always, That this conveyance is made upon the express condition and limitation that the above described premises shall be limited to the retention and use for public purposes, and upon cessation of such retention and use shall revert to the United States without notice, demand, or action brought."

The city of St. Paul has to date allocated the use of subject property for public streets, parkway, and park purposes. However, the city has advised that it has under consideration use of a portion of the property for erection of a replica of the original Winter Carnival Ice Palace; that while the city believes such to be a public use, it wishes to avoid any possible question of title; and, therefore, is desirous of obtaining a release of the aforementioned deed restrictions. By reason that these restrictions were imposed pursuant to an act of Congress (45 Stat. 956) the parties are without authority to remove the same. This bill would, in effect authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant the necessary release.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, shortly I shall have to go to the State Department. The majority leader has asked me to examine Calendar Order No. 1118, H.R. 4177, which would convey to St. Paul, Minn., all rights, title and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to that city. The bill provides for fair market value payment, and therefore the bill in no way contravenes the Morse formula.

CHANGE IN DESIGNATED USE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AT FORT WALTON BEACH, FLA.

The bill (H.R. 7248) to change the designated use of certain real property

conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1184), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7248 is to amend Public Law 86-194 to permit the use of property previously conveyed by that law to include "educational purposes."

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Public Law 86-194, enacted August 25, 1959, authorized the conveyance of 338.75 acres of land on the Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., to be used as a municipal golf course and for other recreational purposes. The city paid the fair market value for the property. Public Law 86-194 contains a reverter clause which provides that "if such city shall ever cease to use such real property for a municipal golf course and other recreational purposes, the title thereto shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon."

Local authorities in Fort Walton Beach, Fla., now desire to use approximately 100 acres of the land originally conveyed, for the construction of a junior college and secondary school facilities. In light of the above referred to reverter clause, limiting the use of the property for "recreational purposes" the city authorities are unable to proceed with their plans without violating a stated condition of the original conveyance. It is therefore desired to amend Public Law 86-194 to expand the condition to include "educational purposes."

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee approves this measure since it is apparent that the property, for which the city paid the fair market value, will continue to be used for the benefit of the public and is in keeping with the intent of Public Law 86-194.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this measure into law will not involve expenditure of any Federal funds.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF OROVILLE, CALIF.

The bill (H.R. 7499) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1185), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7499 is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey approximately one-quarter acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif., without consideration. This small tract of land had previously been donated by the city to the Air Force.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The city of Oroville, Calif., formerly owned the land which is the subject of this legislation. By quitclaim deed executed October 14, 1955, the city conveyed this land to the Government without charge as the site for the construction of an Air Force gap filler station.

Subsequently, operational requirements changed, and plans by the Department of the Air Force to install the gap filler at this location were canceled.

Inasmuch as the property is excess to Department of the Air Force requirements, the Department has, in accordance with routine disposal procedures, screened the property with the Departments of the Army and Navy to determine if there is a requirement for this property within the Department of Defense. The screening process within the Department has been completed with negative results.

The Department of the Air Force has advised the Committee on Armed Services that the estimated fair market value of the property is less than \$1,000.

The city of Oroville has now notified the Department of the Air Force that, in view of the absence of any defense requirement for this property, it desires return of the property for city use. Notwithstanding the city's desire for return of the property and the official position of the Department of the Air Force that the property should properly be transferred back to the city without consideration, the provisions of the Federal Property Act will prevent such a transfer. Consequently, this legislation is required to authorize the return of this property to the city of Oroville.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will not result in the expenditure of any Federal funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] asked me to look at Calendar Order No. 1120, H.R. 7499, which seeks to convey to Oroville, Calif., land of less than \$1,000 fair market value which was originally quitclaimed by the city to the United States without compensation.

Standing alone, the bill could be thought to violate the Morse formula technically. I wish to make a statement in regard to the bill for the RECORD, because I believe that in principle, it does not violate the Morse formula.

The bill involves a small piece of property which the city of Oroville, Calif., donated to the Federal Government through the Air Force for what is known as a filler gap location for a radar screen. The Federal Government, through the Air Force, was perfectly willing to pay full fair market value for that little piece of property at the time, but the City Council of Oroville, Calif.—and quite properly, I believe, through a patriotic impulse—adopted a resolution which Senators will find in the committee report. I ask unanimous consent, without taking the time to read the resolution, that an excerpt from the report, including a portion of the resolution, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following excerpt from the city's resolution, approved at the regular meeting of the city council on October 3, 1955, and signed by the mayor, is indicative of the city's lofty motives: " * * * for the construc-

tion of a permanent low altitude gap filler radar screen; and

"Whereas said radar screen is necessary and appropriate for the defense of the United States of America by the U.S. Air Force and will be used by the U.S. Air Force for such purpose and particularly for defense of the people of the city of Oroville and the surrounding area; and

"Whereas, therefore it appears to be to the best interest of the people of the city of Oroville that said land be quitclaimed to the United States of America for such purposes without consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved * * *"

Mr. MORSE. The resolution pointed out that, after all, the Federal Government was making the installation for the protection of the citizens of Oroville, and therefore it offered to give the piece of property to the Federal Government. That was done.

I say most respectfully to the Defense Department, as well as to the donors, it is too bad that, at that point, a reversionary clause was not inserted, which would have made it perfectly clear that if the property were not used for the purpose for which it was donated, it would revert to the municipal government. Yet one cannot read the resolution and the dealings between the city of Oroville and the Federal Government without coming to the conclusion that this intent was taken for granted. In my judgment, one could question the legal draftsmanship of the original conveyance on this point. The Federal Government has however, now found the property to be surplus. This type of filler gap program has been disbanded, and the Federal Government now wishes to clear any question as to the title of the property and to have it revert in the city of Oroville. I believe it is quite appropriate that it should.

But I make this statement now so that no one in the future will cite the Oroville, Calif., case to show that the Morse formula applies to property transfers when the property is donated by the city, county, or State, and there is no intention that there should be any reversionary clause attached. The Morse formula does apply when there is no intention that the property should come back to a city in case the property is no longer to be used for the Federal purpose for which the donation was made.

In my State there arose the famous Roseberg case, in which, as the senior Senator from Oregon, I took the position that the property fell under the Morse formula. I applied it to my State. I pointed out that if the city intended that the property should revert, a reversionary clause should have been included in the grant. In the Roseberg, Oreg., case there was not the background history that exists in the Oroville, Calif., case.

One cannot read the record without coming to the conclusion that Oroville could have had the full market value for the property at the time of the transfer if it had so desired. The Federal Government was willing to pay it, but the City Council of Oroville, Calif., said, "We donate it, because it is for defense purposes, for the benefit of the people of Oroville. We donate it. Do not pay a cent." Now the Federal Government has

given up the Federal use, the so-called filler gap program for the radar screen in that part of California. The city council resolution speaks for itself.

I want the RECORD to show that, in my opinion, the Morse formula, under the surrounding facts and circumstances of this case, does not apply. But it does not follow that it cannot apply in any other case in which a donation was made without any reversionary clause and in which the city or council or State then tried to get the property back for nothing. That would not be permissible under the Morse formula. I shall continue to object to all such cases. However, when there is a background such as this, I think it would be a misuse of the Morse formula to apply it. Therefore, I raise no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, TO BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9021) to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the reversionary clause effective with respect to the following described tract of land which was conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), shall not operate with respect to such tract of land so long as such tract is used for the public purpose specified in such Act or for public school purposes:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association property (said point being 100 feet north from the original southwest corner of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation and in the north line of Sunnyside Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah); running thence north 0 degrees 00 minutes 28 seconds east along the west line of the cemetery property 237.76 feet; thence southeasterly along the arc of a 573-foot radius curve to the right (tangent to which bears south 57 degrees 37 minutes 13 seconds east) a distance of 157.06 feet; thence south 41 degrees 49 minutes 59 seconds east 21.23 feet; thence southeasterly along the arc of a 730.146-foot radius curve to the left, a distance of 183.86 feet, to a point in the south line of the cemetery property, which is the north line of Sunnyside Avenue; thence south 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds west along said north line of Sunnyside Avenue 272.77 feet to the point of beginning. Containing 0.75 acre.

(b) The reversionary clause effective with respect to the following described tract of land conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), and subsequently conveyed by such association to Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the Act of April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 36), shall not be operable with respect to such tract so long as such tract is used for the public purposes specified in such Acts or for public school purposes:

Beginning at the original southwest corner of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, which is located in Salt Lake City, Utah, and running thence north 0 degrees 00 minutes 28 seconds east along the west line of said military reservation, a distance of 100.00 feet, to the north line of Sunnyside Avenue;

thence north 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds east along said line 272.77 feet to a point in a curve, tangent to which bears south 56 degrees 15 minutes 38 seconds east; thence southeasterly along said curve to the left having a radius of 730.146 feet, a distance of 94.71 feet to a point of intersection with the west line of 14th East Street produced north; thence south 0 degrees 02 minutes 40 seconds west 52.64 feet to the south line of Sunnyside Avenue; thence south 89 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds west along said south line of Sunnyside Avenue which is also the south line of the said military reservation, a distance of 354.77 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.77 acre, more or less.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize the use of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, for public school purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1186), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The amendment made by the committee is in the form of a substitute of new language in lieu of that proposed in the House-passed bill. The basic purpose of the draft bill is to broaden the reversionary clause with respect to a tract of land conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, pursuant to the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), to permit two small contiguous portions of the tract of land in question to be used for public school purposes. The draft bill as passed by the House of Representatives approaches the problem in a rather circuitous manner. The committee, therefore, determined it advisable to clarify the meaning by rewriting the bill in its entirety, thus approaching the problem directly. The objective and the intent of the bill remains the same.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The effect of the bill would be to permit the city of Salt Lake, Utah, and the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association to convey to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City, Utah, two small parcels of land totaling about 1½ acres for public school purposes. Both parcels were a part of the original conveyance to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association provided for under the act of January 23, 1909, and the underlying interest of one tract still remains with the cemetery association. Both tracts are subject to present public use for State and highway purposes. Senator BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss) introduced an identical bill in the Senate (S. 1478).

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The property described in the bill was formerly part of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Utah. Camp Douglas was established in 1862 as a Regular Army post on approximately 4 square miles of public domain lands set aside for military use. The reservation boundary lines were readjusted from time to time by reduction in public land areas, acquisition by purchase of additional land, and transfers and disposals of other areas. Of the original reservation, many areas have been transferred or conveyed to various Federal, State, and local agencies. Fort Douglas, as the reservation

was designated in 1878, currently comprises 3,692.28 acres of public domain land and 3,343.89 acres of land acquired by the United States in fee at a cost of \$99,600.

Pursuant to the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), the Secretary of War executed a deed on February 10, 1909, conveying to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, a 50-acre tract of land, located at the extreme southwest corner of Fort Douglas, which was part of the public domain lands originally set aside for the establishment of the reservation. The deed of conveyance, as required by the enabling act, provides that the land shall be used forever as a cemetery for the burial of the dead and that when it ceases to be used for such purposes shall revert to the United States. The act of January 23, 1909, also provided that the deed would be delivered when the grantee conveyed or caused to be conveyed to the United States in fee simple a certain tract of land containing 150.92 acres. This condition was satisfied by L. H. Young and wife and J. A. Young and wife in January 16, 1909, with the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association paying the consideration of \$12,500 to the Government's grantors.

The granting clause in the deed of the cemetery association also contained the following words: "subject to the right-of-way, 100 feet wide, along the south boundary of said premises which was granted to Le Grand Young by deed of the Secretary of War, dated October 8, 1906, under the act of Congress of June 29, 1906; and subject also to the grant to the city of Salt Lake, Utah, of a right-of-way for a boulevard by act of Congress of February 25, 1907."

The Government's grant of the hundred-foot right-of-way to Le Grand Young for a railroad and wagon road was in turn, subject to public use for highway purposes.

The described right-of-way is not a part of Sunnyside Avenue and is the land described in paragraph (b) of the proposed bill, consisting of 0.77 acre, more or less.

The small tract of land described in paragraph (a) of the bill contains 0.75 acre and is contiguous to that described in paragraph (b). It is likewise a part of the original land conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association under the act of January 23, 1909. However, under the act of April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 36), the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association conveyed to the city of Salt Lake, Utah, approximately 2 acres of their holdings to enable the city to construct a continuation of Eighth South Street into Sunnyside Avenue. The 0.75 acre of land described in paragraph (a) is a part of this 2-acre parcel not actually used for the street extension. The deed of conveyance contained a provision that such tract shall be used for State or highway purposes and so long as used for such purposes the reversionary clause set forth in the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), would not be operable with respect to the tract.

Both parcels of land described in the bill are adjacent to the other property now being acquired by the school board for the expansion of East Side High School in Salt Lake City. The enactment of this measure will enable the city of Salt Lake and the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association to convey their interest in these two tracts of land to the school board and permit the use of the land for public school purposes. If it should cease to be used for such purposes, however, title would revert to the U.S. Government.

The two parcels of land in question have, over the years, become widely separated from the present boundary of Fort Douglas through various disposals of reservation lands.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The U.S. Government appears to have been properly compensated for the land conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association by

the act of January 23, 1909, of which these two small parcels are a part. There is no current or foreseeable military requirement for the property and, since the provisions of the bill would assure continued use of the property for worthy public purposes, and provide a reverter to the United States if such uses should cease, the committee believes the public interest will best be served by the enactment of this measure and so recommends.

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this measure will not entail the expenditure of any Government funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H.R. 9021 seeks to amend the reversionary clause of a 1909 act to permit the use of two small parcels of property for public school purposes. These two small parcels were originally included in a larger tract for which the Federal Government was compensated. The larger tract was conveyed subject to two highway easements. The bill, if enacted, would permit the two small parcels to be conveyed to the school district without a cloud on the title.

Since the Federal Government in 1909 received a fair market consideration for the property as a whole, it is my view that the transaction now contemplated would not fall under the Morse formula requirement. The title to the property ought to be cleared.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think there is another bill to which I should refer, Calendar No. 1122, H.R. 10736, which permits police protection by the State of Virginia to be afforded to a military hospital. There is no application of the Morse formula involved in that bill.

Therefore, to repeat, since Calendar No. 1118, H.R. 4177, contains a fair market value clause, Calendar No. 1119, H.R. 7248, but broadens a reversionary clause regarding land for which a fair market price was paid, and I have just discussed Calendar No. 1120, H.R. 7499, Calendar No. 1121, H.R. 9021, and Calendar No. 1122, H.R. 10736, I would hold that the Morse formula does not apply, for the reasons I have set forth, to any of them.

I thought I should make this statement for the benefit of the majority leader. I must leave to go to the State Department. I understood that the majority leader wanted to call the bills up this afternoon. I have no objection to them.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION EXERCISED BY THE UNITED STATES OVER LANDS COMPRISING THE U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

The bill (H.R. 10736) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1187), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 10736 is to transfer legislative jurisdiction now exclusively vested in the Federal Government to the State of Virginia in order that adequate police protection may be provided by local authorities on the military reservation. This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 88th Congress and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill will, if enacted, provide authority to the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of Virginia all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the legislative jurisdiction the United States may possess over any lands comprising the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.; the retrocession to take effect upon acceptance by the State of Virginia. As a matter of policy, concurrent jurisdiction is always retained by the United States.

The U.S. naval hospital embraces approximately 108 acres of Government-owned land and the major portion of the hospital facility consists of the initial 79 acres acquired by conveyances in 1799 and 1840. The United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over these lands by virtue of several acts of cession of the State of Virginia.

Because the major portion of the hospital facility, comprising a parcel of 79 acres, is held by the Government under exclusive jurisdiction, local police authorities are unable to provide regular police protection. It is understood that, as an emergency measure pending such authority to effect ordinary police patrol as may follow upon retrocession of concurrent jurisdiction, the city of Portsmouth has agreed to respond to specific calls for police assistance within the hospital enclave notwithstanding the lack of legislative jurisdiction. The requirement is for police adequate to protect hospital patients and staff, including nurses quartered at the installation, as well as personal property, buildings, and grounds in an urban environment in which the hospital is physically isolated from other Government activities. Prior to 1957 there had been a civilian guard force. From that time until July 1963, security had been afforded by utilizing limited-duty personnel assigned by the Navy's Enlisted Personnel Distribution Office. Since July 1, 1963, that Office has been unable to provide such personnel.

The Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, in its report approved by the President April 27, 1956, stated, in pertinent part, that "the most immediate need, in the view of the Committee is to make provision for the retrocession of unnecessary jurisdiction to the States." The Committee accordingly recommended that section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, be further amended "so as to give to the heads of Federal agencies and their designees the necessary authority to retrocede legislative jurisdiction to the States." There are presently pending for consideration S. 815 and H.R. 4068 and H.R. 443, 88th Congress, bills designed to implement generally the recommendations of that Committee.

The Department of Defense has heretofore endorsed the enactment of such general legislation which would authorize heads of executive agencies to adjust legislative jurisdiction over installations under their control to meet the needs of individual installations as determined by the agency heads. Most recently, the Department of Defense ap-

peared in favor of passage of S. 815 at hearings on that bill.

H.R. 10736 illustrates, and is consistent with, the general principle and with Department of Defense endorsement of specific legislation authorizing retrocessions which have been enacted within the last few years pending enactment of the general effort.

Accordingly, because it has been decided that effective law enforcement can best be obtained for this installation by local police effort, and in light of the fact that the State has specifically shown its willingness to accept such jurisdiction by passage at the 1964 session of its general assembly of an act, chapter 196, authorizing the Governor to accept such retrocession over the Portsmouth Naval Hospital as many be granted by the United States, the Department of the Navy on behalf of the Department of Defense recommends enactment of H.R. 10736 without awaiting action by the Congress on the above-mentioned general bills. Passage of this bill will permit local police enforcement desired by the Navy over an area which the city is willing to police and in which it is logical for it to do so. Enactment of this measure will not involve the expenditure of any Department of Defense funds.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS AND MOBILE DWELLINGS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8954) to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 409. Travel and transportation allowances: trailers

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in place of the transportation of baggage and household effects or payment of a dislocation allowance, a member, or in the case of his death his dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household goods under section 406 of this title, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in place of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than 20 cents a mile;

"(2) deliver the trailer or dwelling to an agent of the United States for transportation

by the United States or by commercial means; or

"(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States subject to such rates as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not be more than the lesser of (A) the current average cost for the commercial transportation of a house trailer or mobile dwelling; (B) 51 cents a mile; or (C) the cost of transporting the baggage and household effects of the member or his dependent plus the dislocation allowance authorized in section 407 of this title. Any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned. For the purposes of this section, 'continental United States' means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1189), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill as amended by the committee is as follows:

(a) The bill deletes the limitation of 36 cents per mile and inserts in lieu thereof 51 cents as the maximum ceiling which may be paid for the reimbursement of commercial transportation for mobile homes.

This increase is based upon a survey by the Department of Defense which has determined that 51 cents per mile is the current average cost of the movement of mobile homes. This includes 47 cents as the haul rate, plus 4 cents per mile for accessorial charges. The latter includes such items as permit fees, toll charges, etc. The 36 cents per mile is, therefore, unrealistic under existing conditions, in view of the current average cost as determined by the survey.

(b) The bill would extend the geographical coverage for reimbursement, presently limited to points within the continental United States, to the State of Alaska. Under the new language, reimbursement would be authorized for transportation of a mobile dwelling within Alaska or between the continental United States and Alaska.

(c) The bill adds new language which would permit the trailer to be transported by the United States. Under existing law, reimbursement is limited to transportation completed by commercial means. The principal purpose of this additional language is to permit the movement of trailers to points within Alaska where no commercial means for movement are available.

The housing shortage in Alaska is sufficiently critical to justify the extension of the trailer authority to this State.

COST

The Department of Defense has indicated that the additional annual cost of the bill, as amended by the committee, is as follows:

Army	\$375,100
Navy	215,800
Marine Corps	Negligible
Air Force	484,100
Total	1,075,000

IMPROVED OPPORTUNITY FOR PROMOTION FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H.R. 10322) to extend the provisions of the act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86-155, as amended (74 Stat. 396) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1190), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill extends the so-called Navy and Marine Corps hump authority enacted in 1959 from June 30, 1965, until June 30, 1970. The basic law enacted in 1959 provided authority whereby the Navy and Marine Corps, under prescribed procedures, could mandatorily retire Regular officers in the grades of commander and captain, and Marine Corps equivalents, prior to the normal point of retirement. Normally, a commander twice failed of selection to the next higher grade would be retired after 26 years of service, and a captain at 30 years of service. Under this legislation, all officers affected must complete at least 20 years of service, but their retirement points will have been reduced from 1 to a maximum of 7 years.

This legislation has been necessary in order to provide an equitable promotion opportunity to the grades of commander and captain, and Marine Corps equivalents, for those officers who were commissioned during World War II.

During the period of extension—from 1965 to 1970—this authority will be used by the Navy and Marine Corps for the purpose of creating vacancies only for the grade of captain or colonel. The problem of the hump no longer exists in either the Navy or Marine Corps with respect to the grades of commander and lieutenant colonel. It should be pointed out that as a technical matter this authority would be in existence for the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel and could possibly be utilized by the boards for the elimination of officers whose performance did not justify their being continued on active duty for any purpose.

BACKGROUND

The premise of the hump extension authority contained in this bill is the same that necessitated the enactment of the original legislation in 1959. It is the fact that it is essential for the management of the Navy and Marine Corps that its career officers at any point in time be properly distributed in terms of years and experience throughout the grade structure. If this legislation had not been enacted in 1959, about three-fourths of all the Regular officers in the Navy and Marine Corps who were commissioned during World War II would have been forced into premature retirement. This result would have occurred because the anticipated vacancies would have been insufficient to provide a reasonable promotion opportunity for this group of officers, all of whom were commissioned within a 2- to 3-year period. This group in both the Navy and Marine Corps constitutes what is known as the World War II hump. The basic legislation, therefore, has been utilized to provide vacancies in addition to those caused by normal attrition in order to permit these younger officers to be selected into the grades of commander or lieutenant colonel, or captain

or colonel. Without the vacancies, the younger officers would have been mandatorily retired due to nonselection after the completion of 20 years of active service.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE AUTHORITY (PUBLIC LAW 86-155) TO DATE

The basic authority provides for two methods of mandatorily retiring Regular Navy and Marine Corps officers prior to the normal point of retirement. The first method, that was used by the Navy, provides that officers in the grade of captain who have served in grade for a period of 5 years will be subject to board consideration for the purpose of being either continued on active duty or being mandatorily retired. The second method, which has been utilized by the Marine Corps, is to provide for similar type boards for officers in the grade of colonel who have been twice failed of selection to the grade of brigadier general. For the grade of commander in the Navy and lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps the basic authority provides that officers who have been twice failed of selection to the next higher grade will be subject to board action for the purpose of either being continued on active duty or being mandatorily retired.

The number of officers who either have been or will be mandatorily retired prior to their normal retirement point in the Navy and Marine Corps during the effective period of this law, between June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1965, is as follows: In the Navy, approximately 1,047 (or 35 percent) of the captains who have completed 5 years in grade were mandatorily retired under this authority; in the grade of commander, approximately 910 officers will have been mandatorily retired; in the Marine Corps, 240 colonels will have been mandatorily retired, with 30 continued on active duty for a normal career; in the grade of lieutenant colonel, 369 were mandatorily retired, and 3 continued.

The vacancies created under this legislation during the initial 5 year period have enabled the Navy to provide a 45-percent promotion opportunity to the grade of captain and a 65- to 75-percent rate to the grade of commander. Without these vacancies, there would have been only an approximate promotion opportunity of 30 percent to the grade of commander and about 25 percent to the grade of captain. In the Marine Corps, with respect to the grade of lieutenant colonel, without the enactment of this legislation, there would have been about a 25-percent opportunity for selection to this grade. With the vacancies created under this authority, a promotion opportunity of about 70 percent has been possible. With respect to the grade of colonel, the authority contemplated that the vacancies created would permit about a 60-percent promotion opportunity for this grade. Without this authority, Regular officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel would have been confronted with even less promotion opportunity than their counterparts in the Navy.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The need for extending the authority contained in this bill from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1970, is the same as that underlying the original legislation, which is to provide a reasonable promotion opportunity to the grade of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps.

Without the authority to create vacancies by mandatory retirement over the 5-year period in question, promotion opportunity to the grade of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps would be only 30 percent. With this legislation, the opportunity will be 45 percent in the Navy and 60 percent in the Marine Corps.

In terms of the operation of the authority for the next 5 years, in the Navy there will be mandatorily retired approximately 448 of-

ficers in the grade of captain (347 unrestricted line and 101 other groups). In the Marine Corps 326 Regular colonels will be mandatorily retired over the 5-year period prior to the normal retirement point.

As indicated previously, there are no plans for the continued use of the authority for the purpose of mandatorily retiring twice-failed commanders and lieutenant colonels prior to the normal retirement point.

Neither the Navy nor the Marine Corps foresee the need of any use of this authority beyond June 30, 1970, at this time.

With the authority contained in the extension, both the Navy and Marine Corps will be able to retire officers in the grade of captain and colonel progressively over a 5-year period in order to assist in creating the vacancies for the officers in and behind the World War II hump for the purpose of moving these officers into the grades of captain and colonel.

It might be observed that if the extension is not granted, in addition to the lack of promotion opportunity, about one-half of the officers in the grade of colonel in the Marine Corps would be mandatorily retired in fiscal year 1972 and in the Navy, during this approximate time period, about 40 percent of the captains would be mandatorily retired.

SAVINGS PROVISION

Section 3 is a savings provision inserted for the purpose of conforming the changes in the retired serviceman's family protection plan to the provisions enacted in 1959 in the hump authority for this purpose. Basically, this provision operates to prevent the mandatory retirement of an officer under the hump authority from having his rights altered because of his early retirement.

Section 3 of Public Law 86-155 is a savings provision to protect the validity of changes or revocations of elections made by non-continued officers under the Contingency Option Act. Under that act, a member of the Armed Forces may elect to receive reduced retired pay in order that his wife and children may have an annuity after his death. At the time of enactment of Public Law 86-155, elections under the Contingency Option Act had to be made before the member completed 18 years of service. Having made an election, the member could change or revoke it, but such a change or revocation would be void if the member retired within 5 years after making it. It was obviously probable that some of the officers who would be retired early under the hump law would have registered changes or revocations of elections which would be invalidated by their unexpectedly early retirement. In fairness to such officers a savings provision was inserted in the law to provide that such an officer's change or revocation is effective if made at such a time that it would have been effective if he had been permitted to complete his normal 26- or 30-year career.

The Contingency Option Act was amended by the act of October 4, 1961, Public Law 87-381, and was renamed the retired serviceman's family protection plan (codified in 10 U.S.C. 1431-1446). The 5-year waiting period was reduced to 3 years. Further, a serviceman, subject to the 3-year rule, may make an original election after his 18th year and may make a new election after having revoked an earlier one. Because of these changes, it is necessary, in section 2 of the proposed legislation, to amend section 3 of the hump law so as to afford protection to these newly authorized actions. It should be noted, however, that, in order to protect the actuarial soundness of the plan, an officer will not be able to enter or reenter the program after the date on which the board which considers him for continuation is convened. In other words, he is not permitted to wait until he knows that he is about to be retired before deciding to participate in the plan.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The Department's letter concerning the proposed legislation indicates that its enactment would result in increased annual costs ranging from \$497,000 in fiscal year 1966 to \$4,774,000 in fiscal year 1970. For budgetary reasons it was necessary for the Department to state these increases as attributable to these years, but most of the additional cost represents expenditures that, in the absence of the proposed legislation, would have to be made in future years. The retirement of officers prior to their normal retirement points will, of course, cause increased expenditures through the retired pay appropriation until the time when the officers would have reached their normal retirement points. After that, until the officers' deaths, the expenditures in retired pay will be less, because the earlier an officer retires, the lower his retired pay.

Payments for unused leave, for travel from last duty station to home, and for the replacements' travel are all payments that would be made in later years, therefore, do not represent true costs.

There will be a reduction in active duty pay as the retiring officers are replaced by officers in lower pay brackets.

The only direct cost clearly attributable to the proposed legislation is the \$234,000 that may be paid in readjustment pay to 117 colonels who will be eligible for the payment if they are retired under the legislation.

The costs which would result from not passing the legislation are probably greater. They are difficult to state in dollars and cents, since it is impossible to put a price tag on the loss in combat effectiveness that would result from the assessment of 70 percent attrition on the commanders and lieutenant colonels who are the war-tested hard core of our future leadership.

In the long run and in the overall view, the Committee on Armed Services believes that the monetary costs of the proposed legislation will be negligible.

AUTHORITY TO SELL CRUDE OIL FROM UMIAT FIELD, NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

The bill (H.R. 6299) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical, and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1193), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would provide temporary authorization, until January 1, 1969, for the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell petroleum from the Umiat Field of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska. The purpose of this sale is to aid petroleum exploration and development in the nearby areas outside the naval petroleum reserve.

EXPLANATION

The Navy owns oil reserves at Umiat, Alaska, an area deep within the Arctic Circle, hundreds of miles from a town or city. The Umiat Field was discovered in 1945 during Navy exploration of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Exploration was suspended in 1954. Estimates of the recoverable oil in this field have varied from 30 to 122 million barrels. There is now no economical method for transporting oil out of the area.

Within recent years private oil companies have engaged in oil exploration and development in this area. Fuel requirements for commercial drilling on nearby lands outside the reserve must be airlifted from Fairbanks, a distance of 350 miles, or barged in from wells in Canada, 1,000 miles away. Consequently, the current cost of fuel oil at Umiat is very expensive—more than \$35 a barrel compared with approximately \$3 a barrel in Anchorage, Alaska. This oil is necessary as fuel for diesel-powered drilling equipment and to provide heating for the machines and men who operate the equipment.

The combined production capacity of the two wells that are almost immediately capable of providing the production contemplated by this bill is about 500,000 barrels over a period of less than 5 years. This production would be less than 1 percent of the oil in this one 6,000-acre field within the 23-million-acre reserve.

WHY CONGRESSIONAL ACTION REQUIRED

Under section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, oil is ordinarily produced from the naval petroleum reserve only to protect or conserve these reserves or whenever the oil is needed for national defense, and the production is authorized by joint resolution of the Congress.

If commercial oilfields are successfully developed outside the reserve, the private oil companies presumably will devise and develop means of transporting the oil out of that area. If this were done, the Navy would then have access to the oil it owns within the reserve so that this oil might be produced and used in times of national emergency. For this reason the Department of the Navy favors enactment of the bill.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this bill would not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds since the Navy plans that the sales contract will provide that the purchaser is responsible for all production costs. On the contrary, Government revenues will be increased by the amount of the purchase price.

The basic law, section 7430(b) of title 10, United States Code, requires public sale of production from the reserves to the highest qualified bidder. The committee was informed that the Navy plans to use the Seattle, Wash., posted price of marine diesel bunker fuel as the base price for the oil to be sold in the Umiat Field. This price would be increased by a differential factor that gives weight to the remoteness of the area. This weighted price would become the maximum at which the oil could be sold by the successful bidder to other explorers and developers in the area. The successful bidder will be the one that offers the largest return to the Department of the Navy from the weighted maximum price.

INCREASE IN BASIC RATES OF PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business continue to be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate pro-

ceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1126, the bill S. 3001, and that the bill be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3001) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, S. 3001, the pending bill, was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Armed Forces on July 9. The purpose of the bill is to provide a simple and timely increase in basic pay for career members and the junior officers of our Armed Forces.

TIMELY INCREASE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Ordinarily the committee would not recommend a military pay increase at this time, for it is well known that Congress passed military pay legislation in the previous session of Congress, which became effective October 1, 1963. However, since legislation increasing the pay of the civilian workers of the Federal Government, in even greater percentage, has now passed both Houses, it is only fair that a military pay increase be passed at this time in order to maintain a reasonable comparison in compensation trends for military personnel.

The budget of the President for this year included a pay increase not only for civil servants of the Government, but also for military personnel.

Following the enactment of the Military Pay Act of 1958, which provided for significant increases, there was no further military pay legislation until the Military Pay Act enacted last October, except for an adjustment in the allowances for quarters, effective January 1, 1963.

As Senators know, the civilian workers of the Federal Government, following a pay increase in 1958, also received increases in 1960, 1962, and except for the supergrades, January 1, 1964. The latter was an automatic increase provided for in the legislation of 1962.

As Senators are all aware, the Senate and the House of Representatives both approved legislation providing for a substantial civilian pay increase. That measure is now pending in conference.

It is now a regular part of the congressional procedure—almost ritualis-

tic—to grant a civilian pay increase in every election year. The military have not been that fortunate. They have been compelled to wait, and I must assume some responsibility for delay, because I had delayed a military pay increase on one or two previous occasions, to see whether or not legislation providing for a civilian pay increase would finally be enacted. That carried the military pay increase over for another year. So the military has consistently been behind the civilian workers of the Federal Government with respect to timing in receiving a pay increase.

We all know that the legislation now in conference will be enacted into law, and under the circumstances an increase in military compensation is not only warranted at this time, but is imperative if we are to deal justly with those in the military services. Those who wear the uniform are entitled to the same consideration as those who carry on civilian work. Those who wear the uniform have no 40-hour week. They do not receive any overtime pay. They must work 90 hours a week. There are a number of other benefits that civilian workers have granted to them in their work that are not available to those in our armed services.

SUMMARY OF INCREASES

Mr. President, I turn now to the specific provisions of the bill. In summary, the bill provides for a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay for all personnel, enlisted and commissioned, with more than

2 years of service. In addition, for commissioned and warrant officers with less than 2 years of service, the bill provides for a 8.5-percent increase in basic pay.

AN 8.5 PERCENT INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR OFFICERS WITH LESS THAN 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

For the junior officers with less than 2 years of service the 8.5 percent increase would provide an average monthly increase of approximately \$19 for the O-1 second lieutenant, and \$22 for the O-2 first lieutenant. In terms of total annual compensation, the O-1 second lieutenant with dependents would receive \$4,790, as compared with \$4,563 at present. A first lieutenant would receive \$5,388, as compared with \$5,214 at present.

The reason that the commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service will receive an 8.5-percent increase as compared with a 2.5-percent increase given to other members of the armed services lies in the fact that the commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service have had no increase whatever since 1952 in their basic pay.

It may be remembered that when the Senate passed the last pay bill for the Armed Forces it allowed an increase for our commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service, but after long discussion in conference that provision was lost. It went down the drain. This modest increase of \$19 a month for a second lieutenant and \$22 a month for a first lieutenant is thoroughly justified, in my opinion.

A 2.5-PERCENT INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR ALL PERSONNEL WITH OVER 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. President, for officers with over 2 years of service the bill provides a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay which would authorize average monthly increases as follows: For the O-2 first lieutenant, \$11; for the O-3 captain, \$15; for the O-4 major, \$18; for the O-5 lieutenant colonel, \$22; for the O-6 colonel, \$26; and for general officers, O-7 brigadier general through O-10 chief of staff, a range from \$31 to \$49 per month.

Therefore, all Members of the Senate can see that these increases are extremely modest.

As an example of the effect on total annual compensation for officers with typical years of service, the O-1 first lieutenant with dependents would receive \$7,735 as compared to \$7,595.

For enlisted personnel the effect of the 2.5-percent increase on those with typical years of service with dependents is as follows: The E-4 would receive \$4,158, as compared to \$4,098 at present. The E-6 would receive \$5,575, as compared to \$5,480 at present, and the E-9 would receive \$7,783 as compared to \$7,638 at present. Table 2, beginning on page 6 of the report, sets forth the amounts for each pay grade. Those figures show that these increases are very small indeed.

I ask unanimous consent that table No. 2 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE NO. 2.—Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)

OFFICERS

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed				Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase			
O-10	Chief of Staff; Chief of Naval Operations; Commandant, USMC; Chairman JCS.	5	30	Basic pay	\$1,970.00	\$2,019.30	\$49.30	2.5			
				Personal allowance	1 333.33	1 333.33	0	0			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 201.00	1 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 160.20	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00	
				Total, monthly	2,552.21	2,601.51	49.30	1.9			
				Total, annual	30,626.52	31,218.12	591.60	1.9			
O-10	General, admiral	32	30	Basic pay	1,785.00	1,829.70	44.70	2.5			
				Personal allowance	1 183.33	1 183.33	0	0			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 201.00	1 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 160.20	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00	
				Total, monthly	2,217.21	2,261.91	44.70	2.0			
				Total, annual	26,606.52	27,142.92	536.40	2.0			
O-9	Lieutenant general, vice admiral.	110	30	Basic pay	1,575.00	1,614.30	39.30	2.5			
				Personal allowance	1 41.67	1 41.67	0	0			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 201.00	1 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 160.20	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00	
				Total, monthly	1,865.55	1,904.85	39.30	2.1			
				Total, annual	22,386.60	22,858.20	471.60	2.1			
O-8	Major general, rear admiral (upper half).	495	30	Basic pay	1,420.00	1,455.60	35.60	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 201.00	1 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 160.20	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00	
				Total, monthly	1,668.88	1,704.48	35.60	2.1			
				Total, annual	20,026.56	20,453.76	427.20	2.1			
O-7	Brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half).	643	28	Basic pay	1,235.00	1,266.00	31.00	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 201.00	1 201.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 160.20	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	165.00	
				Total, monthly	1,483.88	1,514.88	31.00	2.0			
				Total, annual	17,806.56	18,178.56	372.00	2.0			
O-6	Colonel, captain	15,371	24	Basic pay	1,000.00	1,025.10	25.10	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.	1 170.10	1 170.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.	1 140.10	
				Subsistence allowance	1 47.88	1 47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	245.00	
				Total, monthly	1,217.98	1,243.08	25.10	2.1			
				Total, annual	14,615.76	14,916.96	301.20	2.1			

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE NO. 2.—Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)—Continued

OFFICERS

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed				Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase			
O-5	Lieutenant colonel, commander.	37,461	21	Basic pay.....	\$855.00	\$876.30	\$21.30	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	157.50	157.50	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		\$130.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		245.00
				Total, monthly.....	1,060.38	1,081.68	21.30	2.0			
				Total, annual.....	12,724.56	12,980.16	255.60	2.0			
O-4	Major, lieutenant commander.	56,284	19	Basic pay.....	740.00	758.40	18.40	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	145.05	145.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		120.00
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		240.00
				Total, monthly.....	932.93	951.33	18.40	1.9			
				Total, annual.....	11,195.16	11,415.96	220.80	1.9			
O-3	Captain, lieutenant.....	106,243	8	Basic pay.....	565.00	579.00	14.00	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	130.05	130.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		105.00
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		185.00
				Total, monthly.....	742.93	766.93	24.00	1.8			
				Total, annual.....	8,915.16	9,083.16	168.00	1.8			
O-2	1st lieutenant, lieutenant (j.g.).	55,751	4	Basic pay.....	465.00	476.70	11.70	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	120.00	120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		95.10
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		150.00
				Total, monthly.....	632.88	644.58	11.70	1.8			
				Total, annual.....	7,594.56	7,734.96	140.40	1.8			
O-1	2d lieutenant, ensign.....	50,894	0	Basic pay.....	222.30	241.20	18.90	8.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	110.10	110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		85.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		100.00
				Total, monthly.....	380.28	399.18	18.90	5.0			
				Total, annual.....	4,563.36	4,790.16	226.80	5.0			
W-4	Chief warrant, commissioned warrant.	3,366	24	Basic pay.....	635.00	651.00	16.00	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	145.05	145.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		120.00
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		165.00
				Total, monthly.....	827.93	843.93	16.00	1.9			
				Total, annual.....	9,935.16	10,127.16	192.00	1.9			
W-3	do.....	4,627	21	Basic pay.....	540.00	553.50	13.50	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	130.05	130.05	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		105.00
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		140.00
				Total, monthly.....	717.93	731.43	13.50	1.8			
				Total, annual.....	8,615.16	8,777.16	162.00	1.8			
W-2	do.....	4,999	18	Basic pay.....	470.00	481.80	11.80	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	120.00	120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		95.10
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		135.00
				Total, monthly.....	637.88	649.68	11.80	1.8			
				Total, annual.....	7,654.56	7,796.16	141.60	1.8			
W-1	Warrant officer.....	2,772	14	Basic pay.....	405.00	415.20	10.20	2.5			
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	110.10	110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		85.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	47.88	47.88	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		130.00
				Total, monthly.....	562.98	573.18	10.20	1.8			
				Total, annual.....	6,755.76	6,878.16	122.40	1.8			
ENLISTED											
E-9	Sergeant major or master chief petty officer.	13,546	20	Basic pay.....	\$485.00	\$497.10	\$12.10	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		\$22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	120.00	120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		85.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		105.00
				Total, monthly.....	636.50	648.60	12.10	1.9	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	7,638.00	7,783.20	145.20	1.9	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00
E-8	Master sergeant or senior chief petty officer.	33,795	19	Basic pay.....	415.00	425.40	10.40	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	120.00	120.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		85.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		105.00
				Total, monthly.....	566.50	576.90	10.40	1.8	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	6,798.00	6,922.80	124.80	1.8	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00
E-7	Sergeant 1st class or chief petty officer.	110,621	18	Basic pay.....	370.00	379.20	9.20	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		22.50
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	114.90	114.90	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		75.00
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		105.00
				Total, monthly.....	516.40	525.60	9.20	1.8	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	6,196.80	6,307.20	110.40	1.8	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00
E-6	Staff sergeant or petty officer 1st class.	231,284	14	Basic pay.....	315.00	322.80	7.80	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		20.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	110.10	110.10	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		70.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		100.00
				Total, monthly.....	456.60	464.40	7.80	1.7	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	5,479.20	5,572.80	93.60	1.7	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00
E-5	Sergeant or petty officer 2d class.	405,392	10	Basic pay.....	265.00	271.50	6.50	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		16.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	105.00	105.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		70.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		90.00
				Total, monthly.....	401.50	408.00	6.50	1.6	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	4,818.00	4,896.00	78.00	1.6	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00
E-4	Corporal or petty officer, 3d class.	450,917	5	Basic pay.....	205.00	210.00	5.00	2.5	Sea and foreign duty pay.....		13.00
				Quarters allowance with dependents.....	105.00	105.00	0	0	Quarters allowance without dependents.....		70.20
				Subsistence allowance.....	31.50	31.50	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible).....		70.00
				Total, monthly.....	341.50	346.50	5.00	1.5	Proficiency pay, minimum.....		30.00
				Total, annual.....	4,098.00	4,158.00	60.00	1.5	Proficiency pay, maximum.....		100.00

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE NO. 2.—Examples of present pay and allowances with those proposed for fiscal year 1965 (S. 3001)—Continued
ENLISTED

Pay grade	Title	Number in grade, fiscal year 1965	Typical years of service	Present		Proposed			Alternative or additional (no change)	Monthly amount
				Type	Monthly amount	Monthly amount	Increase	Percent increase		
E-3	Private 1st class or seaman.	585,754	1	Basic pay	\$99.37	\$99.37	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	\$9.00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	155.20	155.20	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	183.10
				Subsistence allowance	131.50	131.50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	1105.00
				Total, monthly	186.07	186.07	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	55.00
				Total, annual	2,070.00	2,232.84	0	0	Proficiency pay, minimum	30.00
E-2	Private or seaman apprentice.	345,891	1	Basic pay	85.80	85.80	0	0	Proficiency pay, maximum	100.00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	155.20	155.20	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	8.00
				Subsistence allowance	131.50	131.50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	183.10
				Total, monthly	172.50	172.50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	1105.00
				Total, annual	2,070.00	2,070.00	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	50.00
E-1	Private or seaman recruit.	160,271	20	Basic pay	78.00	78.00	0	0	Sea and foreign duty pay	8.00
				Quarters allowance without or 1 dependent.	155.20	155.20	0	0	Quarters allowance with 2 dependents.	183.10
				Subsistence allowance	131.50	131.50	0	0	Quarters allowance with 3 or more dependents.	1105.00
				Total, monthly	164.70	164.70	0	0	Flight pay (if eligible)	50.00
				Total, annual	1,976.40	1,976.40	0	0		

¹ Tax free.

² Under 4 months.

NOTE.—Minimum amount of retired pay: For length of service or age, 50 percent of basic pay at 20 years. For permanent disability, 30 percent of basic pay but not less

than 2½ percent times years of service. For temporary disability, 50 percent of basic pay but not less than 2½ percent times years of service. Maximum amount of retired pay, 75 percent of basic pay. This maximum is payable if the member has 30 years of service or at least an 80-percent disability rating.

COMMITTEE APPROACH

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some comment is now in order with respect to the committee approach to this legislation. First, the committee felt that a bill should be reported at the present time, in view of the civilian increases, which, as I have stated, have been much more numerous and substantial than those given to the members of the armed services; second, that the bill should be simple in its approach and in its application.

As the Senate may know, the Department of Defense, in February 1964, submitted a military pay proposal which would have provided for a 2.4-percent increase in basic pay for all enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service and a flat 3 percent in basic pay for all officers both under and over 2 years of service. These percentages were computed through rather complex formulas involving comparisons with a number of civilian type indexes, together with certain retirement discount formulas.

The committee, after consideration, decided on a more simplified approach. First, it was felt that the career enlisted and officer grades should receive the same percentage increases. Let it be remembered that in the last two pay acts enlisted men have received less overall increases than commissioned personnel. Second, it was the committee's opinion that junior officers with under 2 years of service should receive more than the 3-percent increase proposed by Defense in view of the fact that this pay bracket has not been increased since 1952. Third, the committee did not adopt the Department of Defense proposal which would have excluded from any increase the reservists and National Guardsmen who are entitled to drill pay. Historically, reservists entitled to drill pay have been authorized the current basic pay of the grade concerned. Our reservists in a drill pay status are a vital part of our national defense and the committee saw no reason for changing the current law in this regard.

I should observe, Mr. President, that the pending bill does not involve additional costs over what the Defense proposal would have involved when the inclusion of drill pay in the increase is taken into account. The defense proposal would have cost \$191 million annually. With the inclusion of drill pay an additional \$11 million is involved. The pending bill involves for the Department of Defense an additional annual cost of \$202,441,000, which is the total increase for 1,833,000 men on duty in our Armed Forces.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED

Mr. President, the increases contained in this bill would affect 2,762,000 persons, including 1,833,000 on active duty, and 879,000 in the Reserves.

This is a very simple proposal. In my opinion the proposed increase is fully deserved by our men and women in the uniform, and I urge that the Senate pass the bill promptly.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, since the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee introduced this bill and has brought it to the Senate for consideration, I have received letters from wives of enlisted men who have served less than 2 years, complaining that they had received no increase in pay and that their living costs have substantially increased. How can I answer such letters?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there may be some cases of men who voluntarily enlisted and who may have a complaint. Otherwise, I do not believe there is any merit in this suggestion. For the most part the enlisted personnel, during their first 2 years, are in a purely training status.

In addition, most men with less than 2 years' service live in barracks and eat at Government mess halls. The E-1 recruit, upon his entry into military service is assured, through normal promotion, during his first 2 years of service, of three automatic pay raises during that period, with a good chance of receiving four.

Under existing law, at the end of 4 months, a man with less than 2 years'

service receives an increase of \$5.20 a month.

That is more than the bill gives to those who serve more than 2 years.

Moreover, although the requirements vary among the military departments, it is possible for a recruit to be promoted during that period to the grade of E-4, which is corporal, although he may have served less than a year.

There may be a few instances of married men who have voluntarily enlisted; but we know now that none who are married are drafted. They cannot be taken involuntarily. But the vast majority of the less-than-2-year men live in barracks. They are housed in Government barracks, are fed in the Government mess, and receive their automatic increases in pay during that period.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kansas is the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and has handled pay increases.

Mr. CARLSON. I am familiar with the pay schedules of the civil employees.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is familiar with the pay increase for civilian employees. He understands the absolute impossibility of dealing exactly equally with every employee, because some who are in the same category will have jobs that are twice as hard and involve more responsibility than others in the same grade or whatever the classification is.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Georgia has been most helpful. I appreciate his comments. The pay increase is justified. The Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the committee, and the other members of the committee are entitled to much credit for the fine way in which they considered and reported the bill.

I hope it will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there anything in the act passed last year which would give the Department of Defense the opportunity to come before Congress every year or so to obtain increases such as are provided in the instant bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; nothing was written into the law. We do not treat the military personnel as we do the civilian personnel by providing automatic increases for them. We did not provide anything in the bill that would authorize such action.

In the committee report it was stated that if the increases we had allowed, which were the first that had been granted since 1958, were not adequate, the Department of Defense could come back and submit an additional program this year. I do not know whether this proposal was submitted in pursuance of that statement or not; but that statement was in the committee report.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the cost to the Government for the increases made available last year was in excess of \$1 billion a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it was in excess of \$1 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I feel that the increase we provided last year, a sum of more than \$1 billion a year, was rather generous. This year, 1 year later, we are again increasing the salaries of generals and admirals and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and so forth, by an additional \$207 million a year. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; this amount is \$201 million. It is \$207 million if we include the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are all supposed to be a part of the armed services.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount is \$207,510,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That is for the Public Health Service, the Coast Guard, and the Armed Forces.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear what the Senator from Georgia stated was the justification for the increase; but, as I understand, the committee did not spend much time in holding hearings, did it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it did not.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the justification for such an increase so soon after the previous pay raise?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Louisiana knows that we could have held hearings over the weeks and could have built up a record that would have been very long to sustain this proposal. But I did not hold hearings because I thought the hearings that had been held on the civilian pay increase bill, which showed the difficulty of retaining personnel in the civil service and showed the increase in the cost of living, applied in every respect to the Armed Forces.

The Senator well knows that in 1955 Congress increased the pay of civil service employees by 7.7 percent on the average; in 1958 it increased their pay 10.1 percent; in 1960 it was increased by 7.7 percent; in 1962 we increased the pay of civil service employees by 5.5 percent on the average; and in January 1964, we increased the pay of civil service employees

by 4.1 percent. Under that bill, there was an automatic increase, in January of this year, of 4.1 percent.

Only the other day the Senate passed another bill to increase the pay of civil service employees by 4.2 percent, but that percentage ran from 3 to 22.5 percent for classified employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. To 33 percent in one case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Thirty-three percent in one case.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what caused me to vote against the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, too, voted against that bill. But this bill provides an increase of only 2½ percent. That is the highest increase, except for the group of less-than-2-year officers, who would get 8 percent. In general, a 2½-percent increase is the highest that anyone in the military service would receive.

I do not see how anyone can justify leaving the military personnel so far behind when we have increased the pay of civilian employees again and again. Of course, that was not done with my vote; I voted against that increase.

The Government has contributed to inflation. It is said that the pay increase is not inflationary; but it would be difficult to find anyone who would not say that his costs of living have not been affected by inflation. The Government has contributed to the wage spiral by its constant increases in civil service pay. But I do not believe the man in uniform should be discriminated against because he does not have a Government employees' union that is permitted to come to Washington and lobby with Senators and Representatives to obtain pay increases. That is one reason why I encouraged the committee to report the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not try to promote a footrace between those who serve in the Armed Forces and those who are employed in the civil service. If one branch receives a pay raise, I do not believe in providing the other branch with a raise whether it is justified or not. I do not believe that is the way Congress should act.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not propose to have a footrace; but, in my judgment, those who serve in the Armed Forces are more entitled to a pay increase every year than are the civil employees of the Government. If we increase the pay of civil employees even more than they are entitled to, I do not propose to see those who wear our country's uniform discriminated against and denied an increase.

So long as I have anything to do with it, I shall continue to urge the Senate to deal equally as between those who are in the civil employment of the Government and those who are risking their lives in Vietnam and elsewhere today and who tomorrow may be called upon to risk and give their lives in large numbers. I believe they are as much entitled to an increase as are the employees of the Senate and, for that matter, Members of the Senate themselves. We voted ourselves a large increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was \$7,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. We voted ourselves an increase of \$7,500 at one fell swoop.

I may be entirely wrong in my philosophy, but if Congress, whatever may be its reason—perhaps because it does not understand the situation, perhaps for political reasons, to build a Frankenstein of so many Federal employees—is unwilling to say, "No," I do not propose to see those who have no other voice in Washington discriminated against when we distribute tax funds to those in civilian Government employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the armed services were very well treated last year. My reason for asking the questions was to be at least consistent. I think it has been clearly indicated here one pay increase leads to another; and that the whole process is threatening to get out of hand.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I am trying to do. I am trying to be consistent. We are not being very consistent if we give to those in uniform only a 2.5-percent increase, while we give a 4.2-percent increase to civilian employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I note that table I, proposed increases in one bracket in basic rates for officers under 2 years, shows that the increase will be \$49.30.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take the admirals and generals.

Mr. RUSSELL. None of them has served as little as 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under 2 years, there is an increase of \$102 in comparison to \$34.20 for one over 10 years. Why is it that the longer they serve the less increase they seem to get?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The reason is that those figures were computed, yet they do not apply to a single living human being. Those figures should have been marked with asterisks and explained. We seem to give a greater percent of increase to those who serve less than to those who serve more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Those figures were based on a mathematical formula. They do not apply to a single living human being. They are available in case the President should reach down and make some second lieutenant with less than 2 years' service, say, a Chief of Staff in the Army or an admiral in the Navy. Those figures would then apply. Unless the President did that, they would not apply to anyone. They do not apply today.

Mr. ELLENDER. What this table shows is a little confusing, to say the least. It shows that for under 2 years' service the increase will be greater than for those who have served over 30 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. That is because none of them is in that category. There is not a man in these high grades who would be affected by this pay increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. So I am to understand that generals and admirals who have served less than 2 years will not receive the increase of \$102?

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that generals and admirals who have served under 2 years will not receive the increase of \$102?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would, if there were any such. The Senator knows that there are no generals or admirals who have served less than 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know it. I am asking.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will look at the last figures on the right, he will see the total number involved. He will see that many, if not most of our generals and admirals have served more than 20 years—most of them more than 30 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see that. In each category of generals and admirals, there are 32 who would be affected.

Mr. RUSSELL. No—there are 32 people affected who would receive \$44.70 a month. I do not believe that is a great increase to give a general or an admiral.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Georgia that I am not complaining about it. I am only wondering why this table should show—

Mr. RUSSELL. It was really an oversight, because in making a mathematical computation we take it out; not a living soul would be affected by it, because we raised it by 8½ percent since they have not had a pay increase since 1952. Therefore, we increased them a bit more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Looking at the same figure, in the first column, under 2 years, the increase in pay seems to be almost as much, as, if not more than in the case of those who have served longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is several times as much because it is 8½ percent instead of 2½ percent, but no one gets it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me, then, that the table is misleading.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It is, to any one who does not understand the Army's procedure. But the Senator from Louisiana knows as well as I do that there is no general or admiral, nor even a colonel, in the Armed Forces today, who has had less than 2 years' experience.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to vote for the support of the committee. I arrive at the conclusion that I am in support of this recommendation not on the basis stated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, but because I believe that the Services require this increase, and that they are properly entitled to it. Strictly on that basis, I am for the report of the committee.

I believe that we put this problem out of focus when we start comparing the military with civilians.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not altogether comparing it with civilians. I believe a most substantial reason for these pay increases is to keep in our Armed Forces

the very finest young talent that we have, who cannot afford, in their self-interest, to stay with the services when they can get three or four times as much money working for some large industrial concern or some big business organization.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thoroughly agree. I am glad to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement. Moreover, as the chairman of the committee so ably points out, many of our fine young men in the services are not there by their own choice. Certainly, we should treat them as well as the report of the committee indicates they should be treated. I wholeheartedly agree with the report of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that it has become common in this country to "slough off" the officers of our Army and to talk about the "brass," but there are no more dedicated men in the service of our country than those in uniform. I know of more men personally who are serving at great financial sacrifice in the Army of the United States than I do in any other walk of life in this Nation or in any other enterprise.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am sure that many of us share that view.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. (At this point Mr. McGovern took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for the work he did with reference to the officers in the services with less than 2 years of service. The adjustments in pay in that category were long overdue.

We talk about morale. This is where a relatively few dollars will certainly boost morale. The Senator has been very fair and much concerned about this matter, and took it upon himself to lead in making the adjustment, and I commend him highly.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will recall that when we passed the last pay bill we undertook to do something about young officers with less than 2 years service, but we ran up against a stone wall.

In order to get a bill, we had to give up that increase. The Senator is exactly correct. We cannot expect too much from the morale of these men, discharging the same responsibilities as their colleagues who have served, perhaps, for 2 years and 2 days, and are drawing substantially more money than they are.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that the Senator from Georgia has devised a plan which will prevail and become the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the work which he has done on this bill. I believe that these pay raises are justified. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has rendered a very fine service. I shall support the measure.

I wish to inquire as to one or two categories. One is that of the man with less than 2 years' service, which I shall come to later. But first I wish to ask the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the committee, if he would accept an amendment to the substance of S. 2021, which was drafted last year, as an amendment to another pay bill. This is the amendment which would give a Reserve officer's widow the same protection that a Regular Army officer's widow would receive, if the officer died during a 30-day period after his retirement and before the first check came in. I should like to send the amendment to the desk—

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I am thoroughly familiar with the provision. It has considerable merit, but I have been hopeful to get this bill approved. The bill which will follow the one now before the Senate, the dual compensation bill, to equalize the opportunities of Reserve officers and Regular officers serving in the Federal Government, is a much more proper vehicle for this amendment than the pay bill. I hope that the Senator will defer offering his amendment for an hour or so and offer it to the dual compensation bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill deals with military retirement pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand. So does the other bill. It deals with compensation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The other bill deals solely with civilian compensation after the personnel have left the military service and entered civilian employment.

I have worked on the bill long and hard in order to get action for these people.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in favor of that bill. But I regret that the Senator sees fit to offer it as an amendment to this bill. He has worked hard on the dual compensation bill. There is no doubt in my mind that the dual compensation bill is a more appropriate place for the amendment than a bill which provides for a straight pay increase and does not deal with retirement or pension.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The dual compensation bill is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This amendment, S. 2021, comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, not under our committee. We could not appropriately put it in our bill, or we would have written it into the bill. It is a matter that has come before the Armed Services Committee. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, the bill had been offered as an amendment long before the bill was introduced. While the Defense Department has not seen fit to write a report, the Social Security Administration has. In its report, it comments on the relatively insignificant financial effect of the plan. It applies only in the very limited case of a Reserve officer who has served his time and then dies before the first of the following month, on which day his first check would be received by the widow. The widow gets nothing, although the officer has selected his annuity plan.

The proposed amendment would provide that the annuity eligibility would go into effect when he retired. If he had been a Regular officer and retired, this annuity gap would not arise.

The amendment would apply to only a very limited class. It would apply only in the case of an officer who died in that 30-day period. If he were to live 30 days, past the first of the month, the widow would receive the annuity. It is a great hardship. The husbands have served out their time. They have earned the pension.

The Board of Actuaries advising the Defense Department says it would not cost more. The reason that the Board of Actuaries says it will not cost more is that the men have already earned it. They have designated their widows as the survivors. Then they die before the annuity can be collected. There is a hiatus in the law that has existed for years.

We have taken this measure up with the committee. We have offered a bill. To this day, the Defense Department—which says it wants to see fairness done in this case—has never answered the request of the committee chairman. It has never given a report on the bill. It ought to be as fair to the widows of officers who die as they are to those who are still in the service.

The chairman has rendered a distinguished service. The only way that we can get fairness for the widows is to bring this measure out on the floor of the Senate. The Defense Department has not prepared an answer to the committee with regard to this measure, and 11 months have gone by.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman to please accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I freely confess that the Senator has a case. I do not believe there are many people involved. But that is no reason for doing an injustice, if only one person is involved. If there is any disparity, I want to correct it. But I wish that the Senator would not insist that I accept his amendment to the bill. If I do it now, it will go to conference. That would mean that the Senate amendment would undoubtedly be lost in the conference. It would mean a delay in the enactment of the bill, whereas I have every reason to believe that in the form the bill is in today, it will pass without any conference.

I shall be glad to again urge the Department to make a report on the bill. I am in favor of the bill proposed by the Senator. If we receive a report from the Department, I shall be glad to bring it to the attention of the committee and bring the bill on the floor.

I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment to the bill. The bill affects many people of relatively small income. If the amendment were agreed to, it would cause a delay of a month or two in the pay that these people would receive.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished chairman. Were this January, of course, I would not attempt to offer the amendment. But considering the lateness of the session, this is the only

way that we can obtain justice in this session for this very limited class of people.

The bill has not yet passed the House. The bill would go to the House. It has not yet reached the state of conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. I had hoped that it would not reach the state of conference. I had reason to believe that if it were passed in the form in which it was reported by the committee, it would not go to conference.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the House were to strip this amendment from the bill, there would be no occasion for a conference unless the Senate then voted for the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the entire House voted for the amendment, it would go to conference. The bill has not been introduced in the House. The military pay increase bill has not been introduced in the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the amendment were agreed to, the question of whether the bill would then go to conference would be a matter for the entire Senate. Suppose the amendment were agreed to. If the House removed the amendment from the bill, then the question of whether or not there would be a conference would depend on whether the Senate insisted on its amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had assumed that if we were to send the bill over with the amendment included in it, the House would probably ask for a conference, if it were to pass the bill. If it did not ask for a conference, the Senator is correct from a parliamentary standpoint. The Senate could recede. But if a conference were requested, the Senate would have no option. We could not dispose of the bill then in any other way.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Board of Actuaries certified that there would be no additional cost. It seems to me highly improbable that there would be a conference in the closing days, when it is so difficult to get a bill passed on this small amendment that might affect a dozen widows who have already earned the annuity, and, merely because their husbands died before the 1st of the month, they cannot receive it. We worked on this problem for more than a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have great compassion for the small number of people involved in the bill. But I cannot accept a retroactive amendment that goes back to 1951.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I would like to read a sentence from the report of the chief actuary, Robert J. Meyer, of the Social Security Administration, advising the Defense Department on this bill. It is dated April 7, 1964. It reads:

Accordingly, from our point of view, we would have no objection to S. 2021 as drafted in its present form, insofar as its bearing on the cost of the plan is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's report is based on a bill on which the Department of Defense has not yet submitted a report. I assure the Senator that I will obtain a report on the bill from the Department of Defense within the next 3 weeks so that the matter can be considered. But I cannot accept a retroactive amendment to the bill.

I regret it very much. I am for the Senator's proposal. When we get a report from the Defense Department, I intend to move to report his bill. But I cannot accept a provision on the pending bill which is intended to have retroactive application.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, has my amendment been stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas has not yet been stated. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 15, it is proposed to add a new section 5, as follows:

That (a) section 1437 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "Each annuity" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each annuity".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any case in which a person—

"(1) has met all the requirements for the receipt of retired or retainer pay under chapter 67 of this title,

"(2) has made an election in favor of a beneficiary or beneficiaries under section 1434 of this title, and

"(3) dies prior to the date on which he would have first become eligible for the receipt of retired or retainer pay under such chapter 67,

an annuity shall be paid under this chapter to such beneficiary or beneficiaries, as the case may be, upon application filed by such beneficiary or beneficiaries as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, beginning as of the first day of the month in which such person would have been eligible to receive retired or retainer pay under chapter 67 of this title had he not died."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall become effective as of October 1, 1963, but no benefits shall accrue to any person as a result of the enactment of such amendments prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated April 7, 1964, from Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, referring to the bill S. 2021, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., April 7, 1964.

Mr. R. L. WALTER,

Chairman, DOD Joint Board, RSFPP, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUDY: This is in response to your request to the Board of Actuaries in regard to its views on S. 2021.

The following recommendation on this bill is based on our understanding that it is of extremely limited scope in that it would only apply to reservists who are not in active-duty status for the fractional-month period between the time that they attain age 60 and the first day of the following calendar month. As the law now stands, such individuals who have elected to participate under the plan do not have any protection thereunder in the rare event that they die in this fractional-month pe-

riod. The bill would change the situation so that they would have this protection.

As we understand the bill, there would be no deduction from the subsequent retired pay for the fractional-month protection afforded. From a strictly actuarial-equivalent approach, there should be such a proportionate deduction for the fractional-month period involved with respect to all the reservists affected—not only the few dying in this fractional month but also the vast majority who live through it.

The Board of Actuaries has considered this problem from a broad viewpoint. After taking into account both the administrative problems that would be created by requiring proportionate deductions for the fractional-month period and the relatively insignificant effect on the financing operations of the plan resulting from such proportionate deductions, the Board does not consider it necessary that such proportionate deductions be required. We would, of course, have no objection if they were required.

Accordingly, from our point of view, we would have no objection to S. 2021 as drafted in its present form insofar as its bearing on the cost of the plan is concerned. We are somewhat concerned, however, about the policy involved in this bill, since such a procedure might well serve as a precedent to cover similar cases of deaths in active service under the plan, and the cost of doing this is not covered in the financing provided.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MYERS,
Chief Actuary.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my amendment is identical in terms with the bill S. 2021. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, as he stated, is fully conversant with the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the amendment be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF YARBOROUGH AMENDMENT TO
MILITARY PAY BILL

This amendment concerns payment of annuities for survivors of retired members of the Armed Forces. Under present law a member of the Armed Forces may elect to accept a reduced amount of retired pay in order to provide an annuity for his widow, or children under 18 years of age and who also meet other limiting conditions. This annuity may be 50, 25, or 12½ percent of the reduced amount of the man's retired or retainer pay.

In order for the intended beneficiary to qualify for the annuity, the serviceman must have been in receipt of retired pay at the time of his death. For the convenience of Government bookkeeping, an individual does not start receiving retired pay until the beginning of the month following the month in which he actually qualifies for retired pay.

Thus if he dies between the date on which he qualifies for retired pay and the first of the following month, his intended beneficiary will receive no annuity.

This amendment would correct the unintended inequity by amending section 1437 of title 10, United States Code so that in cases in which a serviceman has completed all the age and service requirements for the receipt of retired pay but dies between the date on which he qualifies and the first of the following month, his properly designated beneficiaries will receive the annuity to which they are entitled.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appeal once more to the distinguished Senator from Georgia to accept the amendment. I have worked for more than a year on

this proposal for the limited class of people who have been so disadvantaged. A Reserve officer who has been in military service has earned his retirement. He might have designated his wife as an annuitant. He has earned that annuity by his service to our Government in the uniform of his country. If a Regular Army officer retires on the first of a month and dies before the first of the next month, this problem does not arise, but if a Reserve officer should die in a similar situation, his wife would not receive a red cent. He might have served for a period of more than 20 years. He has earned the annuity. Yet his wife might be left penniless.

This is a question which is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee; it is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We have worked on S. 2021 for more than a year. We have brought the proposal in the form of a bill to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman. We were told to offer the proposal as a separate bill. Last August we introduced the bill. For 11 months, the Defense Department has declined to give the committee a report on the bill. The Department would kill it by its refusal to report. But the board of actuaries advising the Defense Department has rendered a report and has shown that it would have no substantial cost.

The deceased Reserve officers have earned the annuity. It is money that the officers earned while in the uniform of their country.

The injustice is so great that, I believe, with the great prestige of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services behind the proposal, the House of Representatives would accept it, if the chairman would accept it. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his work on the pending bill. I shall support the pay bill. But I point out that here is a group of people who have suffered and waited for a long time, and we have been unable to obtain a report from the Defense Department on the subject. I think it is time that someone acted in behalf of those affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment. If the Senator will offer the amendment to the dual compensation bill, which deals with equalizing the discrepancies between Reserve officers and Regular officers, and which is to follow the pending bill, I shall be happy to support the proposal. But I do not think it has any place in the pending bill. It would be much more in order in connection with the bill H.R. 7381.

The Senator from Texas is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think he should offer his proposal as an amendment to the bill H.R. 7381, rather than the pending bill. The proposal could only result in delaying a modest increase in compensation to those in the service of our country. The bill providing for dual employment and dual compensation

deals with a condition which has existed for a great number of years.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I point out that the dual compensation bill deals only with compensation and not with retirement.

Mr. RUSSELL. No retirement benefits are provided in the pending bill. The bill H.R. 7381 deals with equalizing inequities between Reserve officers and Regular officers. The pending bill applies to both, Reserve and Regular, in reference to the proposed pay increase. I insist that the bill is much more in order on the bill H.R. 7381, which is to follow consideration of the pending bill. I shall be glad to support the proposal in connection with that other bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill S. 2021. It is a military question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not been too sure that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction of that bill, because many questions relating to Reserve officers are handled in the Finance Committee. I was for the bill, and I was hoping that we could obtain a report on the subject and bring the bill before the Senate. Therefore, I have not raised any question of jurisdiction. But I cannot accept the bill as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is willing to appoint a special subcommittee of members of the Committee on Armed Services who will not be too busy in the closing weeks, and who would be willing to serve on such a subcommittee to consider the bill S. 2021. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The amendment possesses great merit. Standing on its own bottom, I would be happy to support it. There is no doubt in my mind as to the action that would be taken. However, I do not wish to speak for a subcommittee that has not yet been appointed. I shall be happy to appoint a subcommittee of three members of the Committee on Armed Services to consider the bill immediately. I shall appoint such a subcommittee today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President I appreciate that action of the distinguished chairman, particularly his offer to appoint the subcommittee today. We had not asked the chairman for such prompt action. I am grateful for it.

Mr. President, in view of that statement, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question with reference to the paragraph of the report beginning on the second line from the bottom of page 1, which reads:

The basic pay for those with under 2 years of service has not increased since 1952, as compared to the other pay brackets which have been increased in varying amounts in 1955, 1958, and 1963. The committee was of the opinion, therefore, that an increase for the under-2-year officer pay brackets in excess of that provided for the over-2-year pay brackets was justified in view of the lack of past increases for these brackets.

My question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia is, Has this situation existed with reference to servicemen in grades E-1 to E-5 since 1952? Have they had no increases in pay since 1952?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. All of those with under 2 years of service, whether enlisted men or commissioned personnel, have not received any basic pay increase since 1952. There is a considerable difference, however, in the status of commissioned and enlisted personnel in the under-2-year bracket. Most of the first 2 years service of the enlisted men is spent in training of one kind or another, whereas the commissioned personnel have had their training and are supposed to embark upon their duties when they reach the organization to which they are assigned.

In addition, married men are no longer drafted. Most of these men are single and live in Government barracks and eat at the Government mess; whereas the officers in many cases have to find housing and have to eat outside and do not have the benefits of the Government mess. That is the reason why the distinction is made.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Those in grades E-1 to E-5 who have been in service for over 2 years also live in barracks and eat at Government mess.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they have over 2 years' service, they receive the increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Those who served for 2 years also received an increase in 1955, 1958, and 1963.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But during that same period of time, as was so ably pointed out by the chairman of the committee in his statement in support of the entire bill—and I am in support of it—civilian employees of the Government have received numerous increases.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Of course, civilian employees of our Government do not live in Government barracks or eat at the Government mess.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And they do not receive hospitalization.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. During that period of time, with the exception of E-1 through E-5, the privates, the corporals, and all the rest of the lower grades, have received three other raises in addition to those here proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is not as unfair as it seems because the less-than-2-years servicemen are automatically assured of three pay raises during that 2-year period—three promotions. At the end

of 4 months they receive an increase of \$5.20 under existing law. At the end of 1 year they may receive increases because of promotion that amount to about 18 or 20 percent of their initial pay. That is due to the pay increases established by existing law.

I do not believe the same rule applies to enlisted men that applies to officers, who in many cases are married and who are from 4 to 7 years older, on the average, than enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, who are very well provided for in the barracks and at the mess.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The letters I have been receiving over the years from those in these grades and their families are not in accordance with the opinion expressed here that they do not need the increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me for interrupting, if the selective service regulations had not been changed so that married men are no longer subject to the draft, I would have supported a pay increase for this category, but under the present selective service regulations, a married man is not subject to induction or compulsory service. Therefore, these are usually single men, between the ages of 18 to 21. There are individual cases in which married men, even though they may have had a child or two, have enlisted for one reason or another. In that latter case, this pay is not adequate, but I do not believe we should overpay 98 percent of those for whom this pay bracket is adequate in order to equalize the pay for the 1 or 2 percent for whom the compensation may not be adequate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I cannot agree that \$78 a month or \$83.20 a month or \$85.80 a month, for example, in grades E-1 and E-2 is overpayment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not said they are overpaid. I said if we were to give them a substantial increase, they would be overpaid. I think this pay is about right. At one time we increased the compensation of the recruit in the U.S. Army, as I recall, from \$30 to \$65 or \$70 a month, which was the largest increase ever given. It was in 1942. Since that time it has been increased to \$78.

The 2-year service members are, in a sense, discharging their obligation to their country. If they remain in the service longer and desire to make a career of it or serve for longer than 2 years, they will receive the benefit of these pay increases.

Very frankly, I do not think the situation justifies an increase of pay which would bring about a great increase in the total cost of the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Could the distinguished chairman of the committee inform me, or does the staff have the figures, as to what the increase in cost would be if the pay of the enlisted men were increased, not by the 8½ percent the officers and warrant officers would receive, but by only 2½ percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be only \$28 million, but such an increase in those pay brackets would mean an additional pay of only what would be spent in a night over the weekend or perhaps on a case of beer. It would not be a sub-

stantial increase. If their pay is to be increased, it should be an 8- or 10-percent increase, on the ground that they have been passed over. Personally, I do not think they are entitled to one, because they live in Government quarters, in barracks. Ninety-nine percent of them eat at the Government mess. I refer to those with less than 2 years' service. All of them are engaged in training for at least 4 months, and the majority of them are in training for 1 year.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They could not very well eat anywhere but in a Government messhall, at \$78 a month.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. If they did not eat there, we would increase their pay also.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have had legislative counsel draft a proposed amendment to increase the pay of these enlisted men by 2.5 percent. I agree with the distinguished chairman that it ought to be 8.5 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say it ought to be. If they should receive an increase, that is what they should receive. I do not believe they should receive an increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I made a rapid calculation that it would cost \$26 million. The staff claims it would be \$28 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are increasing the pay of all the civil servants. We are increasing the pay of every military person except those who have served less than 2 years, below grade 5. The tables show that some majors have served under 2 years but are also receiving an increase. Table 1 shows majors and lieutenant commanders with less than 2 years of service who are getting an increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. I challenge the Senator to name one in that category.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The figures show that.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the President were to reach down to one of these recruits and appoint him Chief of Staff, he would get an increase of \$49.30 a month, but the possibility of the President doing that is remote, and therefore the figures do not mean anything.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The distinguished chairman has challenged me to name one major.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have challenged the Senator to name a lieutenant commander or major who has less than 2 years of service. There may be a few medical officers, of course.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Table 1 shows 10 majors with less than 2 years' service.

Mr. RUSSELL. There undoubtedly may be a few officers that I overlooked.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And also captains and lieutenants. The table shows 2,527 captains and lieutenants with less than 2 years' service. It shows 4,861 first lieutenants, or lieutenants junior grade.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of them would receive an 8½ percent increase.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that table 1 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE No. 1.—Proposed increases in basic pay rates for officers (1965) (S. 3001)

[Cost figures in thousands of dollars for 12 months]

Pay grade	Title	Years of service																Total
		Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30		
C/S	Chief of staff:																	
	Proposed	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	\$2,019.30	
	Present	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	\$1,970.00	
	Increase	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	\$49.30	
	Number																5	
	Cost																\$3	
O-10	General; admiral:																	
	Proposed	\$1,302.00	\$1,347.90	\$1,347.90	\$1,347.90	\$1,347.90	\$1,399.20	\$1,399.20	\$1,506.90	\$1,506.90	\$1,614.30	\$1,614.30	\$1,722.00	\$1,722.00	\$1,829.70	\$1,829.70	\$1,829.70	
	Present	\$1,200.00	\$1,315.00	\$1,315.00	\$1,315.00	\$1,315.00	\$1,365.00	\$1,365.00	\$1,470.00	\$1,470.00	\$1,575.00	\$1,575.00	\$1,680.00	\$1,680.00	\$1,785.00	\$1,785.00	\$1,785.00	
	Increase	\$102.00	\$32.90	\$32.90	\$32.90	\$32.90	\$34.20	\$34.20	\$36.90	\$36.90	\$39.30	\$39.30	\$42.00	\$42.00	\$44.70	\$44.70	\$44.70	
	Number																32	
	Cost																\$17	
O-9	Lieutenant general; vice admiral:																	
	Proposed	\$1,153.80	\$1,183.80	\$1,209.60	\$1,209.60	\$1,209.60	\$1,240.20	\$1,240.20	\$1,291.50	\$1,291.50	\$1,399.20	\$1,399.20	\$1,506.90	\$1,506.90	\$1,614.30	\$1,614.30	\$1,614.30	
	Present	\$1,063.30	\$1,155.00	\$1,180.00	\$1,180.00	\$1,180.00	\$1,210.00	\$1,210.00	\$1,260.00	\$1,260.00	\$1,365.00	\$1,365.00	\$1,470.00	\$1,470.00	\$1,575.00	\$1,575.00	\$1,575.00	
	Increase	\$90.50	\$28.80	\$29.60	\$29.60	\$29.60	\$30.20	\$30.20	\$31.50	\$31.50	\$34.20	\$34.20	\$36.90	\$36.90	\$39.30	\$39.30	\$39.30	
	Number																96	
	Cost																\$14	
O-8	Major general; rear admiral (upper half):																	
	Proposed	\$1,045.20	\$1,076.20	\$1,101.90	\$1,101.90	\$1,101.90	\$1,183.80	\$1,183.80	\$1,240.20	\$1,240.20	\$1,291.50	\$1,347.90	\$1,399.20	\$1,455.60	\$1,455.60	\$1,455.60	\$1,455.60	
	Present	\$963.30	\$1,050.00	\$1,075.00	\$1,075.00	\$1,075.00	\$1,155.00	\$1,155.00	\$1,210.00	\$1,210.00	\$1,260.00	\$1,315.00	\$1,365.00	\$1,420.00	\$1,420.00	\$1,420.00	\$1,420.00	
	Increase	\$81.90	\$26.40	\$26.90	\$26.90	\$26.90	\$28.80	\$28.80	\$30.20	\$30.20	\$31.50	\$32.90	\$34.20	\$35.60	\$35.60	\$35.60	\$35.60	
	Number																25	
	Cost																\$11	
O-7	Brigadier general; rear admiral (lower half):																	
	Proposed	\$868.20	\$927.60	\$927.60	\$927.60	\$968.70	\$968.70	\$1,025.10	\$1,025.10	\$1,076.40	\$1,183.80	\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00	\$1,266.00	
	Present	\$800.28	\$905.00	\$905.00	\$905.00	\$945.00	\$945.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,050.00	\$1,155.00	\$1,235.00	\$1,235.00	\$1,235.00	\$1,235.00	\$1,235.00	\$1,235.00	
	Increase	\$67.92	\$22.60	\$22.60	\$22.60	\$23.70	\$23.70	\$25.10	\$25.10	\$26.40	\$28.80	\$31.00	\$31.00	\$31.00	\$31.00	\$31.00	\$31.00	
	Number																2	
	Cost																\$1	
O-6	Colonel; captain:																	
	Proposed	\$643.20	\$707.40	\$753.30	\$753.30	\$753.30	\$753.30	\$753.30	\$753.30	\$779.10	\$902.10	\$948.00	\$968.70	\$1,025.10	\$1,112.10	\$1,112.10	\$1,112.10	
	Present	\$592.80	\$690.00	\$735.00	\$735.00	\$735.00	\$735.00	\$735.00	\$735.00	\$760.00	\$880.00	\$925.00	\$945.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,085.00	\$1,085.00	\$1,085.00	
	Increase	\$50.40	\$17.40	\$18.30	\$18.30	\$18.30	\$18.30	\$18.30	\$18.30	\$19.10	\$22.10	\$23.00	\$23.70	\$25.10	\$25.10	\$27.10	\$27.10	
	Number																6	
	Cost																\$1	
O-5	Lieutenant colonel; commander:																	
	Proposed	\$514.50	\$604.80	\$645.90	\$645.90	\$645.90	\$666.30	\$702.00	\$748.20	\$804.60	\$850.80	\$876.30	\$907.20	\$907.20	\$907.20	\$907.20	\$907.20	
	Present	\$474.24	\$590.00	\$630.00	\$630.00	\$630.00	\$650.00	\$685.00	\$730.00	\$785.00	\$830.00	\$855.00	\$885.00	\$885.00	\$885.00	\$885.00	\$885.00	
	Increase	\$40.26	\$14.80	\$15.90	\$15.90	\$15.90	\$16.30	\$17.00	\$18.20	\$19.60	\$20.80	\$21.30	\$22.20	\$22.20	\$22.20	\$22.20	\$22.20	
	Number																10	
	Cost																\$2	
O-4	Major; lieutenant commander:																	
	Proposed	\$434.10	\$528.00	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$573.90	\$599.70	\$640.50	\$676.50	\$707.40	\$738.00	\$758.40	\$758.40	\$758.40	\$758.40	\$758.40	\$758.40	
	Present	\$400.14	\$515.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$560.00	\$585.00	\$625.00	\$660.00	\$690.00	\$720.00	\$740.00	\$740.00	\$740.00	\$740.00	\$740.00	\$740.00	
	Increase	\$33.96	\$13.00	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.90	\$14.70	\$15.50	\$16.50	\$17.40	\$18.00	\$18.40	\$18.40	\$18.40	\$18.40	\$18.40	\$18.40	
	Number																10	
	Cost	\$4	\$2	\$1	\$3	\$12	\$61	\$504	\$938	\$1,599	\$1,603	\$1,664	\$2,105	\$3,184	\$300	\$47	\$12,072	
Commissioned officers with less than 4 years of active service as an enlisted member																		
O-3	Captain; lieutenant:																	
	Proposed	\$353.70	\$450.90	\$481.80	\$533.10	\$558.60	\$579.00	\$609.90	\$640.50	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	\$656.10	
	Present	\$326.04	\$440.00	\$470.00	\$520.00	\$545.00	\$565.00	\$595.00	\$625.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	\$640.00	
	Increase	\$27.66	\$110.90	\$111.80	\$113.10	\$113.60	\$114.00	\$114.90	\$115.50	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	\$116.10	
	Number	2,527	742	579	14,595	16,763	16,740	17,559	11,389	3,620	1,148	1,330	922	3,517	138	191	91,760	
	Cost	\$839	\$97	\$82	\$2,294	\$2,736	\$2,812	\$3,140	\$2,118	\$699	\$222	\$257	\$178	\$679	\$27	\$37	\$16,217	
O-2	1st lieutenant; lieutenant (junior grade):																	
	Proposed	\$281.40	\$384.30	\$461.40	\$476.70	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	\$486.90	
	Present	\$259.36	\$375.00	\$450.00	\$465.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	
	Increase	\$22.04	\$9.30	\$11.40	\$11.70	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	\$11.90	
	Number	4,861	18,914	15,135	6,662	2,725	1,162	737	254	112	44	8	1	1	1	1	50,617	
	Cost	\$1,286	\$2,111	\$2,070	\$935	\$389	\$166	\$105	\$36	\$16	\$6	\$1					\$7,121	

TABLE NO. 1.—Proposed increases in basic pay rates for officers (1965) (S. 3001)—Continued

[Cost figures in thousands of dollars for 12 months]

Pay grade	Title	Years of service																Total
		Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30		
O-1	2d lieutenant; ensign:																	
	Proposed	\$241.20	\$307.50	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30	\$384.30		
	Present	\$222.30	\$300.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$375.00		
	Increase	\$18.90	\$7.50	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30	\$9.30		
	Number	37,113	6,720	1,676	1,377	530	279	78	9	2						1	47,785	
	Cost	\$8,417	\$605	\$187	\$154	\$59	\$31	\$9	\$1								\$9,463	
Commissioned officers with over 4 years of active service as an enlisted member																		
O-3	Captain; lieutenant:																	
	Proposed				\$533.10	\$558.60	\$579.00	\$609.90	\$640.50	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30		
	Present				\$520.00	\$545.00	\$565.00	\$595.00	\$625.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650.00		
	Increase				\$13.10	\$13.60	\$14.00	\$14.90	\$15.50	\$16.30	\$16.30	\$16.30	\$16.30	\$16.30	\$16.30	\$16.30		
	Number				227	64	269	499	464	3,148	2,235	2,337	2,173	2,887	188	92	14,483	
	Cost				\$36	\$10	\$45	\$89	\$86	\$616	\$437	\$438	\$425	\$565	\$37	\$18	\$2,802	
O-2	1st lieutenant; lieutenant (junior grade):																	
	Proposed				\$476.70	\$486.90	\$502.20	\$528.00	\$548.40	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$563.70	\$563.70		
	Present				\$465.00	\$475.00	\$490.00	\$515.00	\$535.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00		
	Increase				\$11.70	\$11.90	\$12.20	\$13.00	\$13.40	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.70	\$13.70		
	Number				11	76	662	750	492	1,013	719	526	523	322	38	2	5,134	
	Cost				\$2	\$11	\$97	\$117	\$79	\$167	\$118	\$86	\$86	\$53	\$6		\$822	
O-1	2d lieutenant; ensign:																	
	Proposed				\$384.30	\$410.10	\$425.40	\$440.70	\$456.00	\$476.70	\$476.70	\$476.70	\$476.70	\$476.70	\$476.70	\$476.70		
	Present				\$375.00	\$400.00	\$415.00	\$430.00	\$445.00	\$465.00	\$465.00	\$465.00	\$465.00	\$465.00	\$465.00	\$465.00		
	Increase				\$9.30	\$10.10	\$10.40	\$10.70	\$11.00	\$11.70	\$11.70	\$11.70	\$11.70	\$11.70	\$11.70	\$11.70		
	Number				68	645	642	557	309	544	256	81	3			4	3,109	
	Cost				\$8	\$78	\$80	\$72	\$41	\$76	\$36	\$11				\$1	\$403	
Warrant officers																		
W-4	Chief warrant officer:																	
	Proposed	\$361.20	\$440.70	\$440.70	\$450.90	\$471.60	\$492.00	\$512.40	\$548.40	\$573.90	\$594.60	\$609.90	\$630.30	\$651.00	\$702.00	\$702.00		
	Present	\$332.90	\$430.00	\$430.00	\$440.00	\$460.00	\$480.00	\$500.00	\$535.00	\$560.00	\$580.00	\$595.00	\$615.00	\$635.00	\$685.00	\$685.00		
	Increase	\$28.30	\$10.70	\$10.70	\$10.90	\$11.60	\$12.00	\$12.40	\$13.40	\$13.90	\$14.60	\$14.90	\$15.30	\$16.00	\$17.00	\$17.00		
	Number		2		1		1	1		7	41	145	417	1,040	1,481	230	3,366	
	Cost									\$1	\$7	\$26	\$77	\$200	\$302	\$47	\$660	
W-3	Chief warrant officer:																	
	Proposed	\$328.50	\$405.00	\$405.00	\$410.10	\$415.20	\$445.80	\$471.60	\$486.90	\$502.20	\$517.50	\$533.10	\$553.50	\$573.90	\$594.60	\$594.60		
	Present	\$302.64	\$395.00	\$395.00	\$400.00	\$405.00	\$435.00	\$460.00	\$475.00	\$490.00	\$505.00	\$520.00	\$540.00	\$560.00	\$580.00	\$580.00		
	Increase	\$25.86	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.10	\$10.20	\$10.80	\$11.60	\$11.90	\$12.20	\$12.50	\$13.10	\$13.50	\$13.90	\$14.60	\$14.60		
	Number	2				2		3	24	79	226	870	1,596	1,386	414	25	4,627	
	Cost	\$1							\$3	\$12	\$34	\$137	\$259	\$231	\$73	\$4	\$754	
W-2	Chief warrant officer:																	
	Proposed	\$287.40	\$353.70	\$353.70	\$363.90	\$384.30	\$405.00	\$420.30	\$435.60	\$450.90	\$466.50	\$481.80	\$497.10	\$517.50	\$517.50	\$517.50		
	Present	\$264.82	\$345.00	\$345.00	\$355.00	\$375.00	\$395.00	\$410.00	\$425.00	\$440.00	\$455.00	\$470.00	\$485.00	\$505.00	\$505.00	\$505.00		
	Increase	\$22.58	\$8.70	\$8.70	\$8.90	\$9.30	\$10.00	\$10.30	\$10.60	\$10.90	\$11.50	\$11.80	\$12.10	\$12.50	\$12.50	\$12.50		
	Number	7	10	2	9	21	157	401	473	845	1,032	936	708	329	54	15	4,999	
	Cost	\$2	\$1		\$1	\$2	\$19	\$50	\$60	\$111	\$142	\$133	\$103	\$49	\$8	\$2	\$683	
W-1	Warrant officer:																	
	Proposed	\$238.20	\$312.60	\$312.60	\$338.40	\$353.70	\$369.00	\$384.30	\$399.90	\$415.20	\$430.50	\$445.80	\$461.40	\$461.40	\$461.40	\$461.40		
	Present	\$219.42	\$305.00	\$305.00	\$330.00	\$345.00	\$360.00	\$375.00	\$390.00	\$405.00	\$420.00	\$435.00	\$450.00	\$450.00	\$450.00	\$450.00		
	Increase	\$18.78	\$7.60	\$7.60	\$8.40	\$8.70	\$9.00	\$9.30	\$9.90	\$10.20	\$10.50	\$10.80	\$11.40	\$11.40	\$11.40	\$11.40		
	Number	81	21	36	75	147	443	453	334	595	369	125	80	13			2,772	
	Cost	\$18	\$2	\$3	\$8	\$15	\$48	\$51	\$40	\$73	\$46	\$16	\$11	\$2			\$333	
E-9	Sergeant major; master chief petty officer:																	
	Proposed							\$445.80	\$456.00	\$466.50	\$476.70	\$486.90	\$497.10	\$522.90	\$573.90	\$573.90		
	Present							\$435.00	\$445.00	\$455.00	\$465.00	\$475.00	\$485.00	\$510.00	\$560.00	\$560.00		
	Increase							\$10.80	\$11.00	\$11.50	\$11.70	\$11.90	\$12.10	\$12.90	\$13.90	\$13.90		
	Number							1	6	344	1,418	2,951	3,394	4,559	752	121	13,546	
	Cost								\$1	\$47	\$199	\$421	\$493	\$706	\$125	\$20	\$2,012	
E-8	Master sergeant; senior chief petty officer:																	
	Proposed						\$374.10	\$384.30	\$394.50	\$405.00	\$415.20	\$425.40	\$435.60	\$461.40	\$512.40	\$512.40		
	Present						\$365.00	\$375.00	\$385.00	\$395.00	\$405.00	\$415.00	\$425.00	\$450.00	\$500.00	\$500.00		
	Increase						\$9.10	\$9.30	\$9.50	\$10.00	\$10.20	\$10.40	\$10.60	\$11.40	\$12.40	\$12.40		
	Number						7	166	669	2,711	5,483	8,334	7,511	7,714	1,033	167	33,795	
	Cost						\$1	\$19	\$76	\$325	\$671	\$1,040	\$955	\$1,055	\$154	\$25	\$4,321	
E-7	Sergeant, 1st class; chief petty officer:																	
	Proposed	\$206.39	\$282.00	\$292.20	\$302.40	\$312.60	\$322.80	\$333.00	\$343.50	\$358.80	\$369.00	\$379.20	\$384.30	\$410.10	\$461.40	\$461.40		
	Present	\$206.39	\$275.00	\$285.00	\$295.00	\$305.00	\$315.00	\$325.00	\$335.00	\$350.00	\$360.00	\$370.00	\$375.00	\$400.00	\$450.00	\$450.00		
	Increase		\$7.00	\$7.20	\$7.40	\$7.60	\$7.80	\$8.00	\$8.50	\$8.80	\$9.00	\$9.20	\$9.30	\$10.10	\$11.40	\$11.40		
	Number			4	28	177	1,606	4,412	7,826	18,083	25,268	24,853	15,477	10,836	1,791	260	110,621	
	Cost				\$2	\$16	\$150	\$424	\$798	\$1,910	\$2,729	\$2,744	\$1,727	\$1,313	\$245	\$36	\$12,094	

E-6	Staff sergeant; petty officer, 1st class:																		
	Proposed.....	\$175.81	\$246.00	\$256.20	\$266.40	\$276.90	\$287.10	\$297.30	\$312.60	\$322.80	\$333.00	\$338.40	\$338.40	\$338.40	\$338.40	\$338.40	\$338.40	-----	
	Present.....	\$175.81	\$240.00	\$250.00	\$260.00	\$270.00	\$280.00	\$290.00	\$305.00	\$315.00	\$325.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$6.00	\$6.20	\$6.40	\$6.90	\$7.10	\$7.30	\$7.60	\$7.80	\$8.00	\$8.40	\$8.40	\$8.40	\$8.40	\$8.40	\$8.40	-----	
	Number.....		36	65	3,294	12,231	17,513	27,493	33,889	39,165	40,601	33,426	15,628	6,899	847	197	231,284	-----	
E-5	Sergeant; petty officer, 2d class:																		
	Proposed.....	\$145.24	\$215.40	\$225.60	\$235.80	\$251.10	\$26.130	\$271.50	\$282.00	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	\$287.10	-----	
	Present.....	\$145.24	\$210.00	\$220.00	\$230.00	\$245.00	\$255.00	\$265.00	\$275.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$5.40	\$5.60	\$5.80	\$6.10	\$6.30	\$6.50	\$7.00	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	\$7.10	-----	
	Number.....	4,125	17,141	22,692	38,842	49,343	49,197	56,574	54,773	42,729	31,018	23,470	10,515	4,652	264	57	405,392	-----	
E-4	Corporal; petty officer, 3d class:																		
	Proposed.....	\$122.30	\$184.50	\$194.70	\$210.00	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	\$220.50	-----	
	Present.....	\$122.30	\$180.00	\$190.00	\$205.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	\$215.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$4.50	\$4.70	\$5.00	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$5.50	-----	
	Number.....	40,658	86,792	87,050	84,339	50,338	37,999	27,330	15,950	7,362	6,476	4,824	1,261	515	20	3	450,917	-----	
E-3	Private, 1st class; seaman:																		
	Proposed.....	\$99.37	\$148.50	\$159.00	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	\$169.20	-----	
	Present.....	\$99.37	\$145.00	\$155.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	\$165.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$3.50	\$4.00	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	\$4.20	-----	
	Number.....	347,156	148,916	53,490	19,442	7,952	5,358	1,562	795	470	290	248	63	11	1	585,754	-----		
E-2	Private; seaman apprentice:																		
	Proposed.....	\$85.80	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	\$123.00	-----	
	Present.....	\$85.80	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	-----	
	Number.....	300,830	30,389	8,391	3,371	1,507	863	228	98	84	44	54	25	7				-----	
E-1	Recruit (over 4 months); seaman recruit:																		
	Proposed.....	\$83.20	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	\$112.80	-----	
	Present.....	\$83.20	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	-----	
	Increase.....	0	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$2.80	-----	
	Number.....	47,072	6,184	1,725	705	324	178	100	49	49	22	38	16	5				-----	
E-1	Recruit (under 4 months); seaman re- cruit:																		
	Proposed.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Present.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Increase.....	0																-----	
	Number.....	103,804																-----	
E-1	Cost.....	0	\$208	\$58	\$24	\$11	\$6	\$3	\$2	\$2	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	-----	
	Proposed.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Present.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Increase.....	0																-----	
	Number.....	103,804																-----	
E-1	Cost.....	0																-----	
	Proposed.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Present.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Increase.....	0																-----	
	Number.....	103,804																-----	
E-1	Cost.....	0																-----	
	Proposed.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Present.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Increase.....	0																-----	
	Number.....	103,804																-----	
E-1	Cost.....	0																-----	
	Proposed.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Present.....	\$78.00																-----	
	Increase.....	0																-----	
	Number.....	103,804																-----	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to provide for a 2½-percent increase in pay for all enlisted men in grades 1 through 5, with less than 2 years of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, under the column "2 or less" in the table after line 1, strike out:

145.24
122.30
99.37
85.80
83.20
78.00

And insert in lieu thereof, respectively, the following:

148.87
125.36
101.85
87.95
85.28
79.95

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how many Senators need be present in order to provide for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw my request for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Georgia for the excellent work he has done on the pending bill. The proposed increase in pay for the military is justified. Civilian employees of the Government have received numerous pay raises. The military have not received, in proportion, what the civilian employees have received. Frequently we overlook the important service that is being rendered by our military. They are sent from one country to another. Frequently they are separated from their families. They endure many hardships and make many sacrifices. I am very much pleased that the bill is now before the Senate, and I hope the Senate will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also desire to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for bringing the bill to the Senate. I regret that he does not agree with me that some recognition should be given to the enlisted personnel in grades E-1 through

E-5, who have less than 2 years of service. They are the ones who are the footsloggers, who do the dirty work in the military service. They get the harsh details to perform; they get the cleanup details to perform. They are the ones who do the hard work.

These people have not had an increase in 12 years. The other members of the military services have had three increases in that time. They are the ones who are discriminated against. They are pulled out of their civilian employment and denied the GI bill benefits to go to school after they have completed their military service. No pay increases have been given to them in 12 years. Everyone else in the military service has received increases in pay. This is one group of people who are discriminated against by act of this Government.

I offered my amendment to point up how unjustly these men are being treated. They are sent to the tropics and to Arctic outposts, where they suffer many hardships. Yet they are denied the increase that is given to those who are higher up in the military services.

I do not decry the increases to the other personnel in the military service. They are justified. I see no justification in not increasing the pay of these other people. They are the ones who dig the foxholes, clean out the latrines, work around the messhalls, and go out on security patrols. They do the hardest work in the military service. Yet we are telling them, "No; you are not going to get an increase, because you really do not need the money."

It has been said that they would only spend their money on beer and cigarettes. I do not assume that men who earn \$78 a month will spend that money on cigarettes and beer.

I regret that provisions have not been made for those men.

The remainder of the bill is justified. It is a fine bill otherwise. I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for getting as much as he has been able to get into the bill. However, I feel it leaves out one vital part. I am in favor of the bill, and I commend him and his committee for bringing it to the Senate, even though there are provisions that should be included but which have not been included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I voted against the pay raise bill which was passed a few weeks ago. I did not think it was justified. For that reason I met with my disapproval. The bill pending before us today contemplates giving the military some semblance of an equal increase in pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. Only 2½ percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is much less than we have given to the civil servants of the Government.

I am very much struck by this accidental or deliberate deed. In each elec-

tion year we have given a pay increase to the civilian employees. In 1958, an election year, the pay increase was 10.1 percent. In 1960, another election year, it was 7.7 percent by way of an increase. In 1962, an election year, the increase was 5.5 percent, with an automatic pay increase included in the 1962 measure, to take effect on January 1, 1964.

Again, in 1964, an election year, an increase of 4.2 percent was given.

It may be that such increases are made by accident in an election year.

There are some who will argue that that was by chance, not by deliberation. To accept that argument would require an absolute dismissal of reasoning on my part. It could not have happened that five pay increases were granted in election years without being the product of design and, in my judgment, of abject weakness.

Why in election years do we give pay increases to 2,700,000 employees? Is it because it brings votes? Or is it because in election years the demonstration has been made that the increases are justified?

Finally, if the civilian employees are entitled to pay increases, no one can argue to me that the military personnel are not. Although I voted against the civilian pay raise bill, I shall vote for this bill because, in my judgment, it contemplates nothing more than, in a measure, trying to deal with some semblance of equality with the various employees of the Government, although this measure grants a pay raise of only 2.5 percent to the military personnel.

I wonder when we are going to stop, in election years, indulging in conduct which, in my opinion, is wholly unbecoming the high and dignified office that we occupy in the Senate. The time will have to come. The sooner, the better.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I shall give my wholehearted support to the pending bill granting pay raises to nearly 2 million men and women in military service.

I supported the military pay raise bill last year as a "must"—to bring military pay more in line with that of Federal civilian and private industrial workers doing similar tasks.

Until last year, pay scales for military personnel had not been increased since 1958, although the cost of living had gone up 5½ percent.

Last year's pay bill was a major overhaul of military pay designed to bring greater equity in pay for America's men and women in uniform.

The pending bill is a relatively simple, but very important, across-the-board increase intended to keep military pay reasonably in pace with the increases recently voted by the House and Senate for Federal civilian employees.

I am very pleased that the Senate Armed Services Committee provided an 8.5-percent increase in basic pay for officers and warrant officers with less than 2 years service. Basic pay for this group has not been increased since 1952, while other pay brackets were increased in 1955, 1958, and 1963.

I would say an increase for commissioned personnel with less than 2 years' service is long overdue. Last year I cited

the failure to give a pay boost to these service personnel as a defect of the pay bill of 1963. I am glad that the defect is being remedied.

I commend the members of the Armed Services Committee for recommending an 8.5-percent increase, compared with the 3-percent increase requested by the Department of Defense. About 44,600 persons will benefit from this provision.

The pending bill also provides an increase of 2.5 percent in basic pay for all personnel—officers and enlisted men alike—with more than 2 years of service. About 1,788,000 military personnel will benefit from this increase.

I am happy that the bill also provides pay increases for those entitled to drill pay—the reservists of the various services and National Guardsmen. The Department of Defense proposal would have excluded these persons.

I agree with the Armed Services Committee report that: "Today, the Active Reserves, especially those in a drill pay status, constitute a vital part of our national defense." Therefore, they should be included in this pay raise bill.

What I have said before in support of adequate pay for military persons deserves repetition. There are more than 2½ million military personnel on active duty in our Armed Forces. We depend on them to defend us.

The least we can do is give them fair and decent pay on a par with civilian Government workers and employees in private industry.

I support the pending bill as another step toward fair and decent pay for America's service men and women.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I fully support S. 3001, which the chairman of the committee has urged the Senate to adopt. This military pay bill, which will provide a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay for all personnel with over 2 years of service and an 8.5-percent increase for officers with less than 2 years of service, is fully justified.

As the senior Senator from Georgia has noted, since 1958 civilian workers of the Government will have received four pay increases, including the one that is now in conference. Except for an adjustment in the quarters allowances in 1963, there was no intervening military pay raise following the one received in 1958 until the legislation which was enacted and effective last October 1.

COMMITTEE APPROACH

Mr. President, the committee approach to this problem was to provide the same percentage increase of 2.5 percent for both officers and enlisted men. In terms of dollars, for enlisted men this will provide average monthly increases ranging from about \$7 for the E-4 to about \$13 for the E-9; for officers, this will provide average monthly increases ranging from about \$11 for the first lieutenant, \$18 for the major, and \$26 for the colonel, with general officers receiving increases ranging from \$31 to \$49 per month depending on their rank.

The 8.5 percent increase for officers with under 2 years is fully justified, in view of the lack of increase in this pay

bracket since 1952. This will mean about \$19 for the second lieutenant and about \$22 for the first lieutenant. As the chairman has indicated, the Department of Defense recommended only a 3-percent increase for the under-2-year brackets.

Mr. President, the committee rightfully included all of our Reserves who are presently in a drill pay status, now numbering about 879,000, within the increases of this bill. As a vital part of our national defense, we should continue the historic practice that those in a drill pay status will be entitled to the current pay of the grade.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, this bill, affecting 2,762,000 persons and involving a cost of \$207,519,000, is completely justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3001) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1113, H.R. 6413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6413) to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "if", to insert "the net contents of each such package are clearly and permanently marked thereon and if the labeling of the package conforms with the requirements of this Act or".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1177), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law (the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia) so as to permit packaging of cream, milk, ice cream, and other fluid and frozen dairy products in smaller containers than those presently authorized.

Section 14 of the above cited act reads in part as follows:

"That bottles or jars used for the sale of milk or cream shall be of the capacity of one gallon, half gallon, three pints, one quart, one pint, half pint, or one gill."

Thus, present law forbids the sale of milk in containers smaller than 1 gill in capacity. Because of this restriction, it is necessary for restaurants and other food service establishments to fill individual 1-ounce containers from bulk packages in order to provide individual servings of cream or half-and-half with coffee servings. The committee is advised that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health is of the opinion that unsanitary conditions often result from the exposure of open servings, and the Department does not approve such practice.

Upon enactment of this legislation, the local dairies propose to utilize small, individual containers that would allow the packaging of 1 ounce or less of cream or half-and-half to be used for serving with coffee.

Under the provisions of the bill as amended by the committee, the dairies will have the option of labeling each container filled with cream or half-and-half with the actual net contents, or, alternatively, of packaging two or more of such identical containers in a larger package and labeling such container with the total contents. When the latter packaging technique is used, the actual labeling of each individual unit with the net contents will not be required.

These two alternative methods of packaging appear to be compatible with the existing packaging processes of the dairies and will not require the industry to make any extensive modification of their packaging techniques and equipment. Equally important, it is the view of the committee that these packaging provisions of the bill will benefit and protect the public as the actual packaging of the container with the dairy fluid product will be supervised and accomplished in an environment that maintains high standards of sanitation.

Present law also prescribes a minimum of one-half pint for the quantity of ice cream, sherbet, and similar frozen food products which may be packaged for sale. This obsolete packaging provision does not, of course, take cognizance of modern packaging processes which have been developed by industry in connection with the sale of ice cream and other frozen dairy products. This is apparent from the fact that existing law renders illegal the sale of ice cream in cups smaller than one-half pint, Eskimo Pies, and similar frozen dairy products and desserts.

H.R. 6413 would correct the inadequacy of existing law as it relates to the packaging of ice cream and other frozen products and desserts by providing for all frozen dairy products and desserts to be packaged in units of gallons, 1½ gallons, 2½ gallons, integral multiples of the gallon, or binary submultiples of the gallon of not less than 1 fluid ounce.

In addition to packaging in these quantities, the bill also makes provision for ice cream and other frozen dairy products to be sold in individually packaged portions in integral multiples of 1 ounce, between the limits of 4 and 16 ounces, and in integral multiples of one-half ounce if the portion is smaller than 4 ounces. Also, when 2 or more of these small individual portions are sold in a single outside container (as a package of 24 Eskimo Pies of 3 ounces each), the outside package must be labeled to show properly the number of individual portions contained therein and the total net contents of the package.

On January 23, 1964, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held public hearings on H.R. 6413, at which time representatives of the Commissioners for the District of

Columbia, and the Milk and Veterinary Division, Department of Public Health for the District of Columbia, appeared and testified in support of the bill. Also appearing at the hearing and supporting the bill, as amended by the committee, were representatives from the East Coast Ice Cream Novelties and the American Can Co. No one appeared in opposition to the legislation.

Enactment of this measure will not involve any additional expenditure for the District of Columbia.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN PERMITS TO IMPERIAL SHRINE CONVENTION, 1965, INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1114, House Joint Resolution 888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1178), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia, in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc., on the occasion of such sessions and for other purposes, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners and certain Federal officers to provide for the comfort and protection of all persons within the District of Columbia during the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, which will convene in the District of Columbia on July 13, 1965, and conclude 2 days later on July 15, 1965.

The committee has been advised that the magnitude of the forthcoming Shrine convention will present special problems, as well as exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the city. These problems relate to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the

Shrine parade. In addition, there is a need for the services of the Police Department and the Department of Public Health to be adequately supplemented in order to protect the personal safety and health of the citizenry of the District and the many visitors who will be here.

The enactment of House Joint Resolution 888 will in some large measure take care of these related problems and provide the District Commissioners and certain Federal officials with the authority needed to cooperate fully with Shrine officials in implementing a safe and successful Shrine convention in the District of Columbia.

The principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 888 are as follows:

1. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to make regulations to preserve peace and order, specially regulate traffic, and issue special licenses to peddlers and vendors, such regulations to be effective during the period of the meeting, defined by the resolution as a 10-day period beginning July 8, 1965, and ending July 17, 1965, both dates inclusive.

2. Appropriations are authorized to pay the cost of providing additional municipal services and to pay for other municipal expenses connected with the meeting, estimated at \$216,000.

3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners are authorized to grant permits for the use of public space under their respective jurisdictions, subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

4. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the installation of temporary electrical facilities of all kinds, also subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

5. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend certain equipment belonging to the Department of Defense to be used in connection with providing for the well-being of the expected crowds, also subject to limitations imposed by the resolution.

6. The temporary placing of wires along and across the line of any parade for use by electric lighting and communications concerns is authorized.

7. The effective period of the regulations authorized to be adopted and a penalty for their violation are prescribed.

8. The resolution requires the corporation to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and Federal Government against loss, damage, or liability, and provides that such requirement shall be satisfied by the corporation's submitting to the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior an insurance policy or a bond, or both, in such amounts and subject to such terms as these officials may deem adequate to protect the interests of the respective governments.

9. Finally, the resolution specifically exempts from its provisions the U.S. Capitol Buildings and Grounds, and other property under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Legislation similar in scope to House Joint Resolution 888 has been enacted by the Congress in past years when conventions and other public gatherings have brought great numbers of people into the District of Columbia. On July 25, 1958, Congress adopted a resolution (72 Stat. 412) similar to House Joint Resolution 888 when the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of APONMS was held in the District of Columbia in September of that year. Similarly, another resolution was adopted in connection with the American Legion Convention of 1954 (68 Stat. 743). This joint resolution is patterned substantially after the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1049).

On January 22, 1964, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held a public hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 107, the companion joint resolution to House Joint

Resolution 888. During such hearing, the committee was informed that the Imperial Shrine Convention is held annually in one of the major cities of the United States, Canada, or Mexico, and further, that when the forthcoming 91st annual session is scheduled to convene in the District of Columbia, it is estimated that 150,000 Shrine delegates will be in attendance. As is generally the custom, the Shrine during the course of its convention will present two parades, one at night and the other during the day. It is anticipated that these colorful events will attract more than a million viewers into the downtown area of the city. The committee was also advised that the many Shrine delegates with their families, and the hundreds of thousands of spectators to the Shrine parades and activities may be expected to result in the spending of \$15 to \$20 million in the District of Columbia during the convening of the convention.

A representative of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia appeared at the public hearing on this joint resolution and supported enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 107, but with amendments that makes the Senate resolution identical to House Joint Resolution 888. The committee also received letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, wherein it was indicated that they had no objection to the enactment of the joint resolution. However, the latter imposed an objection to paragraph 6 of the joint resolution which authorizes the Secretary of Defense under certain conditions to lend the Shrine Corp. certain field hospital equipment. The committee carefully considered the objection and concluded that such paragraph should not be deleted. This position was taken for the reason that the provisions of paragraph 6 are intended as standby authority in instances of emergency, and further, the loaning of any such equipment is permissive with the Secretary of Defense and is not mandatory.

PROTECTION OF HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES AND OTHER DESIGNATED OFFICIALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1115, S. 1917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the first paragraph of"; in line 9, after the word "minister", to strike out "Ambassador" and insert "ambassador"; on page 2, line 6, after "chapter 7", to insert "title 18, United States Code"; in the line following line 7, after the word "public", to strike out "minister", and insert "minister"; in line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "adding" and insert "inserting"; at the beginning of line 12, to insert "or any"; in the same line, after the word "security", to strike out "officers" and insert "officer"; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "and", and insert "or"; in line 14, after "1955", to

strike out the comma and "69 Stat. 188," and insert "(ch. 199, 69 Stat. 188; 5 U.S.C. 170e)"; and on page 3, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel

"Whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or offers violence to the person of any head of foreign state or foreign government, foreign minister, ambassador or other public minister, in violation of the law of nations, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis in chapter 7, title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting "112. Assaulting public minister"

and inserting in lieu thereof

"112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel".

SEC. 3. Section 114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before "while engaged in the performance of his official duties," the following: "or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service."

SEC. 4. The Act of June 28, 1955 (ch. 199, 69 Stat. 188; 5 U.S.C. 170e) is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service engaged in the performance of the duties prescribed in section 1 of this Act are empowered to arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating the provisions of section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1179), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1917 is to enable the Department of State better to discharge its responsibility to safeguard certain specified foreign officials while visiting the United States on official business by (1) making it a Federal offense to assault the head of a foreign state or of a foreign government or a foreign minister; (2) making it a Federal offense to kill security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of such duties; and (3) em-

powering such security officers to arrest without warrant persons violating section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such a violation.

BACKGROUND

Presently 18 U.S.C. 112 makes it a Federal crime to assault, strike, wound, imprison, or offer violence to the person of an ambassador or other public minister. The language and terminology of this section dates from a 1791 statute. At that time, and for practically a century and a half afterward, the conduct of foreign relations was almost entirely carried on by an "ambassador or other public minister." Beginning with World War II, however, diplomacy began to be conducted more frequently by the heads of state or governments and by foreign ministers. The average number of foreign ministers visiting Washington each year is approximately 25.

Visits of such nature are undertaken with the advance agreement of the U.S. Government which then assumes an obligation under international law to offer complete protection to the visitor. The first change proposed in S. 1917, therefore, is to make it a Federal offense to assault foreign heads of state or of governments and foreign ministers, as well as the ambassadors and other public ministers now covered by the law.

The second change proposed in S. 1917 is to make the murder or manslaughter of State Department and Foreign Service security agents a Federal offense by adding this group to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1114, which now covers post office inspectors, Coast Guard personnel, internal revenue personnel, immigration officers, as well as Park Service employees, employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry and of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of Agriculture, and employees of the Indian Field Service.

The third provision of S. 1917 authorizes those State Department and Foreign Service security agents, who are entitled under Public Law 104 of the 84th Congress to carry firearms, to "arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating the provisions of section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

These latter two provisions are deemed to be equally desirable by the Department of State.

The Department of State has been carrying out the function of protecting distinguished foreign officials during visits to the United States since 1917. The only authority which State Department and Foreign Service security agents have had, and then only since 1955, is that contained in Public Law 104 of the 84th Congress, authorizing certain security officers, who have qualified for the use of firearms, to carry firearms for the purpose of protecting heads of foreign states, high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States.

Frequently, State Department or Foreign Service security officers are the only protective agents present as high foreign officials move from State to State or city to city in the United States. It is, therefore, deemed important that an offense against the person of the agent be considered a Federal offense. Similarly, the power to make arrests without warrant is considered "a reasonable grant of authority to men who are given a very heavy responsibility and who are scarcely in a position to discharge that responsibility without having such authority." The nature of the arrest power is exactly the same as that given to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. marshals and their deputies, and employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department

of Justice. In the case of State Department and Foreign Service security agents it will be limited strictly to the area of protection of foreign dignitaries.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

S. 1917 was proposed by the Department of State in a letter to the Senate received on July 15, 1963, and referred that day to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT (by request) on July 18, 1963. On July 7, 1964, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the bill at which Richard D. Kearney, Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, appeared on behalf of the measure. Mr. Kearney's prepared statement is appended to the report, together with a letter submitted for the record by the Department of Justice. No adverse comments of any kind were brought to the committee's attention. Following the public hearing, the committee ordered S. 1917 reported favorably to the Senate with amendments, which are largely of a perfecting nature. With the proposed amendments, S. 1917 is identical to H.R. 7651, which passed the House on May 4, 1964, and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. The one noteworthy amendment is a new section 5 added by the House which states:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia."

This language is acceptable to the Department of State which considers it to reflect current practice.

In voting to report S. 1917, the committee noted the limited scope of the measure. Assuming that each of the 110 nations with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, has a head of state, a head of government, and a foreign minister—which they do not—the maximum number of persons entitled to the increased protection contained in the first section will be no more than 330. Likewise, the number of State Department and Foreign Service security agents, who are now authorized to carry firearms, having been qualified for this under the standards of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and who would be affected by the other two provisions of S. 1917, is at present 110. The provisions of S. 1917, therefore, are strictly circumscribed both by the nature of the authorities contained therein and by the number of persons affected. The committee concurs with the executive branch that S. 1917 constitutes a reasonable effort to increase the protection offered to visiting high officials and urges the Senate to take prompt and favorable action on it.

MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE DURING SENATE SESSIONS THIS WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to hold hearings during the sessions of the Senate this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the

bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the armed services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the majority leader has 60 minutes on the bill, and the minority leader has 60 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 7381, the so-called Dual Compensation Act. The amendment would eliminate Senate confirmation of nominations of U.S. postmasters in the top three classes. The amendment would enhance the efficiency of the postal service by extending to postmasters all the merit service principles which now apply to classified Government personnel.

In my judgment, Senate confirmation of the nominations of postmasters is a carryover from horse-and-buggy days, when the country was far smaller, our Government was far less busy, and much more time was available to Senators.

For Senators to spend their time scrutinizing the qualifications of a postmaster in "East Overshoes" does not make any sense. We know we do not do it. We rely on those who are partisans in our States to make recommendations to us. To be frank about it, our partisans do the best they can to assess the qualifications of postmasters; but the only qualification on which they will insist, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, is that the nominee be a good party worker or be active in the party and have participated in political activities.

How can any postal employee aspire to be postmaster when his employment by the Government prohibits political activity, and Senate confirmation makes political activity a virtual necessity for Senate approval of postmasters?

This single ridiculous legal requirement that the U.S. Senate act on the confirmation of the nominations of postmasters compels Senators to devote many hours of valuable time and requires excessive staff time whenever the Senator belongs to the same party as the President.

I tried to keep a record of the amount of time we had to spend in our office, which is fairly typical, on postal appointments. It is shocking. It is a ridiculous waste of time for the staff and for the Senator.

The only argument for immersing postmasters in politics this way is that the nominations of postmasters give Senators a chance to build some patronage, to enhance their position in the political party, to give them some influence, so that they can build a little organization in the State. We who have had experience for even a little while realize how empty such patronage is.

From a political standpoint, the patronage leads to nothing but grief. If we recommend a man for appointment,

and he becomes postmaster, then he cannot take part locally in political activity. The county chairman may have served faithfully in that post, but if he is made postmaster in a little town, he has to remove himself from political activity. That does not make sense. Also, for every successful appointee there are from 2 to 10 or more unhappy or even infuriated "rejectees" who will long resent their Senator's action.

I have had pending for years in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a bill to stop this nonsense. I know at least one other Senator, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], has had a similar bill pending for many years. I introduced my first bill for this purpose several years ago and have reintroduced it at each session, to end this ridiculous situation, but I cannot obtain hearings.

Under the circumstances, my only alternative is to call up my bill as an amendment, which I hesitate to do on this occasion, because it is not directly related to the dual compensation bill. But apparently there is no other bill to be reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service this year which could be amended and would have a chance of passage except this particular one.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join in support of the argument of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. The Senate should not continue the farce of requiring the Senate confirmation of the nominations of postmasters. Certainly I am not qualified to pass on the merits of postmasters in Wisconsin. I do not have the time to study the background of all these individuals.

Sooner or later we should pass a bill similar to that which both the Senator from Wisconsin and I have introduced. Several years ago I introduced a companion bill to achieve the same objective. The sooner we pass such a bill and take postmasters out of the political arena the better it will be for the postal service, the Senate, and the country.

If the Senator from Wisconsin does not press his amendment now I will join him in continuing to urge the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to afford us the opportunity to have hearings on one bill and to get some action on it. The time is long overdue when the Senate should stop this procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to have said that he has a bill pending upon which he cannot obtain hearings in the committee?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have written to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who, in my estimation, is one of the finest Members of

this body, a most considerate and thoughtful man, but I have not been able to get any hearings. I have asked for hearings, but hearings have not been forthcoming.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator would not seek to amend the pending bill—

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had intended to amend the pending bill, but I hope that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has been most considerate and is such an able man, will consider the possibility of scheduling hearings, if not this year, which I know is very late, then perhaps next year, if I return to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that I believe he realizes the situation in—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am sure the Senator realizes that there have been many bills in the committee. They should be acted upon and will require hearings, but I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that there will be hearings on his bill as soon as possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator indicate that in the event hearings are not possible this year, hearings will be held as early as possible in 1965?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree to that. Of course, I am not holding up the measure. It was taken up in committee and discussed. We went over the bills before the committee. The committee thought it best not to try to press for action immediately; but we should certainly have hearings on the pay bill and other matters which are believed to be important.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the Senator's bill, how would the appointments be made?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The appointments would be made strictly on the basis of a civil service examination, on the merit principle, on the basis of the person being qualified through a civil service examination.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Thus liberating Senators from the responsibility of making approvals solely upon the word of political leaders back home and nothing more, because a Senator does not have the time to delve into the matter as deeply as he would like to in making his approval.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It would have three effects. First, it would mean that a person would be appointed on the basis of merit. Second, it would mean a far greater incentive in the postal service for people to aspire to the top jobs, which in most local communities would be that of postmaster. Third, Senators would be relieved of a burden which is excessive and irrelevant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio very much.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for not pressing his amendment at this time, since the bill before us is the dual compensation bill relating solely to one limited field of compensation and not to the matter of qualification and appointment, and particularly since the matter of post office patronage is basically one for the House of Representatives. This is a problem for the House, and if we start in the Senate to—

Mr. PROXMIRE. The House does not confirm nominations of postmasters. The Senate does. It is true that some Senators have delegated a great deal of that patronage to the House. But we in the Senate have the basic responsibility. Conversations with House colleagues and the experience I have gained over a number of years convince me that they, too, recognize that this is a burden, and that it is far more of a political liability than a political asset to them.

I know of very few people who really want this system and who think it is essential politically, or in any other way. Almost everyone agrees that it is not good government.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for withdrawing his amendment at this time.

Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes on the bill.

In answer to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who stated that H.R. 7381 had no effect on civilian military retirement, and that it applied to the dual compensation bill rather than the retirement bill, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the Civil Service Commission, dated July 14, 1964, explaining how the retirement law works.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1964.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your oral request for a review of the existing provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act governing the creditability of military service and for comment as to whether enactment of H.R. 7381 in present form would alter these provisions.

Under existing law, once an employee covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act completes 5 years of civilian service, the act authorizes credit for all of his past periods of honorable active military service, subject to the following exceptions:

1. Credit for military service is barred if the employee receives military retired pay, unless the retired pay is awarded—

(a) On account of service-connected disability which was incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or was caused by an instrumentality of war in line of duty during a period of war, or

(b) Under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code (providing retired pay at age 60

after 20 or more years' non-Regular service by members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces). (5 U.S.C. 2253(b).)

2. Credit is also barred for periods of military service performed after December 1956 (other than periods covered by military leave with pay from a civilian position) if the employee or his survivor is, or upon proper application would be, entitled to monthly old-age or survivor benefits under the Social Security Act based upon any wages or self-employment income of the employee. This credit bar operates from the commencing date of annuity if the social security eligibility exists at that time. If social security eligibility arises after annuity has commenced, the annuity is recomputed to exclude credit for the post-1956 military service from the point of social security entitlement. (5 U.S.C. Supp. IV, 2253(j).)

These Retirement Act provisions relate to service credit only and do not affect an individual's right to retired pay or other benefit deriving from military service. Neither the Retirement Act nor the retired pay statutes contain any provision prohibiting the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and civil service annuity if entitled to both.

For convenient reference, I am enclosing several copies of our informational leaflet BRI 46-226b which explains, in question and answer form, the existing rules on the crediting of military service under the Retirement Act.

H.R. 7381, as passed by the House and reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, proposes no change in the present method (above outlined) of crediting military service for annuity purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. For further clarification, Mr. Ruddock's letter explains the provisions of the present law on retirement. It states that title 5, United States Code Annotated, section 2253(b), provides retired pay only in the event of service-connected disability which was incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or was caused by an instrumentality of war in line of duty during a period of war, or in the case of one who is eligible for military retirement benefits upon the completion of 20 or more years of non-Regular service at the age of 60.

I emphasize that this is a provision of the existing law, and that H.R. 7381 would not in any way change the retirement provision of existing law. We are dealing solely with employment and compensation under dual compensation.

In our discussion of July 10, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] summarized his reasons for opposing certain provisions of this bill. He propounded 11 interrogatories which are printed on pages 16189 and 16190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 9, 1964.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the answers to those 11 interrogatories, and since the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] who propounded them is not present in the Chamber at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have these answers printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interrogatories were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First. H.R. 7381 is not antilabor and anti-veteran. Veterans' preference is modified by

counting for purposes of reduction in force only those periods of service during a national emergency, armed conflict, or war. Peacetime service will no longer be counted in computing preference over nonveterans or veterans not entitled to preference. Any veteran having less than 20 years' service, who therefore does not receive the military retirement unless he is retired on disability, will continue to enjoy all veterans preference. No veteran presently employed by the Government will lose any preference.

Second. There is no evidence that H.R. 7381 will cost any money. In fact, there will be modest savings caused by the reduction in retirement pay for retired Regular officers who obtain civilian positions.

Third. The "buddy system," as it is popularly known, is effectively proscribed by section 204 of the bill. A 6-month waiting period will be necessary before any retired military person can be employed anywhere in the Department of Defense unless unusual conditions exist and requirements specified in the bill are met in each case.

Fourth. H.R. 7381 does not pervert or distort congressional policy in regard to retired military personnel. H.R. 7381 embodies new policy reflecting the needs of the Government in the atomic age for securing the services of highly skilled personnel.

Fifth. There is no evidence demonstrating this bill is economically unsound. Positions in the Federal service need to be filled with the best people we can find. It does not cost a cent more to hire a retired military person to fill a civilian position. In the event he is a retired Regular officer heretofore barred from the Federal service, slight savings will be incurred.

Sixth. Veterans' preference is modified only for purposes of reduction in force and the accumulation of annual leave. These modifications apply only to persons retired from the military with at least 20 years' service who receive retirement benefits.

Seventh. The 1962 employment figures show that approximately 3 percent of our civilian employees are retired military people. Under present law, the only retired military man who cannot be employed by the Government is a Regular officer retired for length of service. Since 85 percent of the military are enlisted personnel and about one-half of the commissioned officers are Reserve, and because some officers retired on disability, the number presently barred from Federal employment who would become eligible for employment is not more than a few hundred a year.

Eighth. Relief provisions for warrant officers and Reserve officers are designed to correct an inequity caused by incorrect administrative interpretation of the present law. These employees were paid for services performed. It would be unconscionable to require them to reimburse the Government.

Ninth. In pursuance of White House efforts for economy in government, H.R. 7381 modernizes employment laws so that the Government can obtain the best qualified personnel available.

Tenth. There are five different retirement systems operated by the Government: Civil service, Foreign Service, railroad retirement, social security, and military retirement. Different rules apply in different cases. A retired career civilian employee may enter the military service, receive the full pay of his military rank and his full annuity. There are many examples of this exact situation.

Eleventh. It is difficult to see how modernized dual compensation laws to allow people to go to work will result in unemployment. On the contrary, it will create opportunities for employment which does not presently exist.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I hope that other Senators will find these answers responsive to the questions

raised during the recess for the Republican Convention. The staff had had time to diligently work on this problem. The answers were prepared by the aid of the staff, and they have boiled them down to less than two letter-size pages. I commend the staff for the fine work they have done. They have had some time and have done their work well.

With these clarifications and the explanation that was made when the bill was taken up July 9, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from pages 16184 through 16191, I feel that it would be merely repetitious for me to explain the bill further at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Texas for putting Mr. Ruddock's letter in the RECORD. Many points were raised in the discussion on July 9 at which time the bill was before us, and while I recognize that the committee's questions are answered in the letter, for clarification I should like to ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding that the bill as it is now before the Senate does not in any way affect or change existing law as regards retirement benefits?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. We have had this matter before the Bureau of Retirement Insurance since our discussion here this afternoon, and they assure me that it would not in any way affect or change the retirement benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One other question in connection with existing law on retirement, I should like to raise this question because I believe it is one which should be given consideration either on this bill or in connection with the next retirement bill. I am referring particularly to the Ruddock letter as it outlined a situation in paragraph 1(b), which reads as follows:

Under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code (providing retired pay at age 60 after 20 or more years' nonregular service by members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces).

In this situation does this individual get credit for the same 20 years' military service in computing both his military retirement and his civil service retirement assuming he works 5 years minimum under civil service? Am I correct that in retiring he can pick up, No. 1, his military retirement benefits for his 20 years or more in military service? That would be No. 1 retirement. Second, as a result of his 5 years of civilian service under the civil service could he retire and draw compensation for this 5 years' civilian service plus the 20 years of military service?

In other words, would he get credit for 25 years under civil service retirement even though he had only worked 5 years? This is what I had in mind when I referred to this as giving a man double credit for his military service.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has correctly interpreted the law. That is the existing law. That is not af-

fected by the bill. Ours is a compensation law, not a retirement law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the question of dual retirement benefits for military service should be pointed out. How would that work if a man in the same category were elected to Congress and were to serve 5 years in Congress? Would he be eligible for the dual retirement in the same manner?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As I understand it, the congressional retirement is different from the service retirement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator from Texas, the Senator in charge of the bill, obtain the answer and have it placed in the RECORD?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We shall obtain the answer and have it printed in the RECORD. That proposal applies to a very limited group.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may be a limited group, but it would be an unusual benefit if it were to apply to Members of Congress. Assuming that the \$30,000 a year salary is in effect 5 years from now, it would mean an additional \$15,000 a year in extra retirement benefits for a man with 20 years' military service as described in the letter from Mr. Ruddock. At a time when we are debating whether we can afford to pay \$1,200 to those who had military service in World War I, it certainly looks strange now to give another group an additional \$15,000 a year. I would agree that the individual involved should have the right to select the higher of the two, but not to receive both retirements.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I know of no Senator who would qualify for this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But it would be possible if a man were working in any department of the executive branch for him to pick up this dual credit for military service in computing his retirement?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. That is the existing law. But that is a limited group. That concerns those in the Reserve. A Regular Army officer could not do that, under the existing law, or under dual compensation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that it is a very limited group. But that does not mean it is right. Does the Senator not feel that the committee, when it brings out a bill that deals with retirement, should take into consideration whether the formula does constitute an unwarranted pension benefit in regard to a particular group?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Undoubtedly the question of whether they have favored positions will be studied. The present law deals only with the compensation of a limited group of retired officers who are retired on length of service and not disability.

We have worked on this problem for 9 years. The work started before I came to the Senate. It took that long to make this much progress. I promise speedier progress on this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. May we have the assurance of the Senator that it will be studied?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. Our committee will comply with the request of the distinguished Senator from Dela-

ware. We shall instruct the staff to include that in the subsequent study when the retirement laws are amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think we should get that assurance. Since the bill before us does not deal with the retirement benefits, I shall not press the point at this time. However, I think these are questions which should have been given a little more careful consideration by the committee before it reported the bill.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who had raised some of these questions, is unable to be present. He has a prepared statement in which he points out his reasons for being disturbed over some of the provisions in the bill and why he felt the bill should have been given a little more careful consideration before being reported by the committee.

Mr. President, upon his request I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on H.R. 7381 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LEE METCALF

As I indicated in our debate on this bill recently, I am disturbed by some of its provisions and omissions. I am prepared to suggest that it be sent back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions that it be restricted to two points. The balance of the proposals should be resubmitted next year after appropriate, and I would hope, more detailed and critical study. The committee should report back a bill which would cancel all obligations of officers found to have been illegally overpaid down to the date of the Comptroller General's ruling of July 9, 1962, and permit the employment of Federal civilian personnel in more than one position up to the length of the Federal workweek, plus a ceiling on total pay.

I assume that these provisions of the bill are relatively noncontroversial. Certainly the ban on two civilian positions hampers several agencies and if guarded by an hours-per-week limit, as in this bill, plus a ceiling on compensation, which is not in this bill, it should be acceptable. As regards the former officers who have illegally received dual compensation, we should avoid working a hardship on innocent citizens even though the total involved is estimated to be \$16 million, most of that sum having been paid out by the Defense Department. In reporting this bill back, I would hope that the committee would include in its report a statement of the total amount involved, by Federal agency, and include the name, military rank, and civilian position of every individual involved who has been illegally paid more than \$500. I think the Congress has a right to know which agencies were delinquent in enforcing the law and the extent of their delinquency. I do not think that innocent persons should be penalized for agency delinquency, but since the agency which is apparently the chief offender is the one department which should be best informed on laws affecting military personnel I see no reason why all the facts should not be made available.

In reporting this bill the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asserted that it had four basic goals in mind.

First, it intended to codify and simplify Federal law on dual compensation, a commendable aim, a job long overdue, but not one to be achieved at the expense of more

important principles. A part of this first purpose, actually a second purpose was to afford what it terms "relief" for the two groups of officers found to be overpaid by some \$16 million. I am agreeable specifically to the second part of this first aim, and generally to the first part.

The second purpose as stated in the committee's report was to remove the present ban on dual compensation for retired Regular officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee reports that under present law such an officer is prohibited from accepting Federal employment because of the maximum salary limitation established under the Dual Office Act of 1894. Perhaps I do not grasp the complexities of these matters as quickly as I should, but are we being advised that the Dual Office Act of 1894 absolutely prohibits civilian employment of a retired Regular officer? That such an officer cannot give up his military pension, temporarily or permanently, and qualify for any job he wants and can get? If the ban is absolute, then I do not believe this to be just or right.

The third purpose stated by the committee report is to modernize dual compensation to remove the \$2,000 per annum ceiling on the amount of compensation any person may receive from the Federal Government for more than one civilian job. I do not think this is a controversial purpose or provision, except, as I have indicated—I think there should be a ceiling on the amount of compensation any individual holding more than one position can receive as long as we have millions of unemployed. This bill provides for no ceiling in salary—only in hours. This is unjust and unfair.

To modernize a law we do not need virtually to erase it from the books, and I urge that this section be modified to place a ceiling on such dual compensation. The ceiling should not be higher than $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the Federal minimum wage. Indeed the provision could be so written as to make it self-adjusting over the years, automatic modernization.

The fourth stated purpose of this bill is to "establish . . . a more equitable employment system" by allowing Regular officers, retired for length of service, or voluntarily, I presume, to take full-time civilian jobs with the Federal Government and still draw part of their military retirement pay. The parts of the bill pertaining to the achievement of this purpose are those which have excited the most firm and articulate opposition.

The urgency of this bill, as I understand the matter, is primarily that of giving relief to the officers who were overpaid some \$16 million. I understand this urgency and am sympathetic to giving them relief. Frankly, I do not consider the other sections as being urgent at all, but since the one modernizing restrictions on dual compensation for civilian jobs is apparently not highly controversial I see no reason why we should not deal with it this session.

I am firmly opposed, however, to the other revisions proposed in this bill until there has been a great deal more fact gathering and an adequate set of hearings and a more comprehensive report is available for study.

My first interest in this bill as it came from the committee was aroused by the alleged urgency of the measure, because of the pending necessity for securing reimbursement of the overpayments—but no figures were forthcoming on the amount of overpayments. The committee report on page 10 flatly stated that the committee was unable to obtain any specific cost information on the amount of the overpayments. Subsequently, in the recent debate, the figure of slightly less than \$16 million was offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. YARBOROUGH.

This is certainly a bare-bones figure. We are offered no explanation as to what depart-

ments made such overpayments and to whom, nor are we even offered an explanation as to why the Comptroller should order repayment and so advise the agencies and 2 years later the committee is compelled to advise this body that the cost figure was not available. This reticence is peculiar, at least, and I would like the committee in its reconsideration of this bill not only to elicit additional information but also to indicate to the Senate why this information was so difficult to come by.

Before we make any changes in the law on dual compensation, beyond that minor change referred to earlier, I think the appropriate committees should conduct hearings on the whole Federal retirement system. I see no more reason for being concerned about dual compensation and the alleged discrimination against Regular military officers than I do about the glaring differences in the various Federal retirement and social security programs.

On a simple bookkeeping basis, what justification is there for requiring a citizen to pay social security taxes; requiring a Federal civilian employee to pay 6.5 percent of his salary into a retirement fund; and levying no tax on the military? I think this is obvious and unjustifiable discrimination and should be brought to an end. It is my understanding that the civil service retirement fund is inadequate for the requirements which will be made on it in future years. Why? How inadequate? To what extent do the claims of retired military people on the civil service funds, deriving from their special privileges in counting military time toward retirement, constitute a drain on the civil service fund? How big is this drain?

What valid arguments are there against establishment of a military retirement fund equivalent to the civil service retirement fund so that retired military men shifting to the civilian payroll can get credit for their military service—but so that the retirement fund can be the beneficiary of the sums accumulated in the military fund for the individual involved?

It has been alleged that the military retirement obligations will mount rapidly in the years ahead and will soon reach \$1 billion a year. To what extent could this rise be offset by adjusting the relationships between a military pension fund and a civilian pension fund? Will the provisions in this bill, pending here today, allowing \$2,000 plus half of the remaining pension benefit for Regular military officers, encourage early retirement and step up the cost of military retirement?

It seems to be that we cannot separate the laws on dual compensation and retirement, despite the honest effort made to do so here in our recent discussion of this measure. If pensioned retirement poses questions for civilian civil service employees, then it is quite unrealistic to say that this bill does not affect the retirement laws. There is no doubt that this bill does affect civil service employees; it does affect their retirement fund; it affects the total cost of Federal retirement programs—and it should be restudied with this in mind.

I firmly believe that some of the inconsistencies in Federal law as regards the right to retire with compensation can be eliminated or reduced. What set of circumstances in real life calls for a cut in the social security payments when wage income rises above \$1,200, and knocks out social security payments entirely at about \$1,700? Yet a retired enlisted man or Reserve officer can draw his retirement benefits regardless of his wage earnings.

I am not prepared to say at the moment in which direction the change should be made. But I do not believe there is any justice in telling a hard rock miner in Montana that if he earns a few dollars in his old age his social security will be reduced or eliminated

entirely, while his son, retired from the military, can draw his full retirement benefits regardless of his other earnings. Surely we can achieve more equity in the law than this.

The original justification for imposing a penalty on social security recipients was a make-work concept. We were going to provide some old-age aid, but require that the aged yield jobs to young people.

As nearly as I can gather, the original justification for an inflexible and very generous retirement policy for the military was to offset low wages and facilitate maintaining a youthful military force. Possibly these are also the justification for not withholding retirement taxes from military salaries. I submit that this is poor logic and poor administration on withholding taxes—and places a burden on the civil service retirement fund. I submit that a generous retirement program is a poor substitute for adequate military pay. And I would like to see a study made of the connection between a generous retirement program and recruitment of military personnel. It is facts I would like to hear, not rationalizations.

I doubt very much that the marked differences between military and civilian retirement rights can be justified in the clear light of a committee hearing. Some differences, very well, but not the present sharp contrast. One requires contributory payments; the other does not. One is very generous in terms of the length of service required, the other is not. One is, with minor exceptions, irrevocable; the other is a fragile thing—the civilian retirement—a fragile thing which can be reduced or eliminated on small provocation.

I submit we need a study of all of these things before we undertake to enact legislation this comprehensive.

I think the dual compensation laws should be modernized. I think they should be equitable. I think they should cover the waterfront. In general, I think dual compensation should be eliminated—that this should be the guiding principle of those drafting the new legislation. If we cannot make the dual compensation laws, as revised, yield immediate equity because of standing commitments to classes of the military already in retirement, then I submit that the laws should be so written as to achieve equity among all military retirees after the date of enactment.

I do not believe that the present bill achieves equity. I do not believe that its accomplishments outweigh its shortcomings. I don't think it is the best bill by any means that can be drawn on this subject, and I urge that another attempt be made.

I have studied many hearings on many bills, and I submit to you in all charity that these hearings leave more questions unasked and unanswered than any other set of hearings I can recall.

I trust no member will take these remarks personally. They are not intended as criticism of any person or committee. The burden of our work is heavy. Time is always at a premium—but I must insist that I do not believe that this measure should pass this year. I believe that it should be recommitted with instructions.

Special privilege if we must have it must serve a vital public function. It should not be suffered as a result of hurried compromise.

Our responsibilities are broad. We have time and the will to write better law. It is our responsibility to do so and to remember that special privilege and discrimination breed riots in hell.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is necessarily absent, may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I fully support H.R. 7381, which would simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of retired members of the Armed Forces in civilian positions of the U.S. Government. I have long recognized the need to permit such officers to be employed by the Government since their technical skills are extremely valuable for our national security.

As it stands now, existing law consists of an 1894 act and a maze of ad hoc amendments to that act. The purpose of these amendments was to extend rather than restrict the eligibility of retired officers to accept civilian positions with the Government, but with the great changes in wages and prices since 1894, the monetary limitations in the basic act have become so restrictive that many conflicting exemption provisions have made enforcement arbitrary, cumbersome, and inadequate.

I first introduced in the 86th Congress a bill, S. 2703, calling for a study by the Civil Service Commission of the entire field of laws affecting the employment of retired officers and the submission to the Congress of a draft bill codifying and revising the laws. The bill also provided for temporary permission to employ retired officers in civilian positions with partial retirement pay. Again in the 87th Congress, I introduced substantially the same bill as S. 1103.

However, in the interim the Civil Service Commission conducted the comprehensive study on this situation which my bill called for, and the study resulted in a draft proposal which I introduced on October 3, 1962, as S. 3780. The pending bill, H.R. 7381, follows the basic pattern of S. 3780 by permitting a combination of retired pay in the amount of \$2,000 per year plus one-half of the balance.

Now more than ever we need experienced, highly trained men and women working in all phases of the Government. The training and expertise which officers of the Armed Forces have gained during their military service are a great asset to the Government and should be utilized rather than wasted, and I am very much gratified that action is now being taken on this bill which presents a reasonable solution to the problem.

I very much regret, however, that the committee has not dealt with two other related aspects of the problem. Another group of skilled former Federal employees is also not being fully utilized under existing law. I refer to civilian retirees of the Federal Government who would, if they could, often be very useful to the Government by serving after retirement on a part-time basis. In the 87th Congress I introduced a measure, S. 1340, which would permit civil service retirees to work up to half time for the Federal Government without losing their annuity benefits. At present a civilian retiree's salary must be reduced by the amount of his annuity allocable to the period of his actual employment. My proposal would eliminate this disincentive to the utilization, at least on a part-time basis, of the skills developed during long years of civilian Government service.

Another provision related to the pending bill would establish controls over the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors, along the lines which now limit the employment of lawyers after they terminate Government service. I first introduced such a bill in 1959 in the 86th Congress as S. 2228 and reintroduced it in the 87th Congress as S. 1104. While this is basically a conflict-of-interest provision, it is nonetheless relevant to the pending measure, which deals with Government employment of military retirees.

When the Congress last recodified the conflict-of-interest laws, in Public Law 87-849, the then-existing conflict-of-interest laws, sections 281 and 283 of title 18, United States Code, were left standing as applied to retired military officers. My proposal would strengthen section 281 and would add additional safeguards.

Since I believe that the basic principle embodied in H.R. 7381 is of overriding importance, I am not at this time pressing these additional proposals. However, I shall soon reintroduce them as separate bills and urge that the committees to which they will be referred give them prompt and favorable attention.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if there is no further request for time, we yield back all time, if all time is yielded back by the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading and passage of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas for the admirable way in which he has handled the bill. The Senator was allowed 2 hours. He took only a few minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It was his patience year after year that resulted in the passage of the bill. It is a just law that has long been needed. A group of our citizens have been discriminated against in their employment. The bill is particularly needed now in the science category and in the space category. We shall obtain the benefit of the technical skill and know-how of a group of retired military personnel in the field of military science. That is where it is needed. That is where the urgent request came from for this law.

We have had the full cooperation of the committee so that this bill might be brought out of the committee.

FRAUD IN AID PROGRAM FOR IRAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation wherein under our foreign aid program our Government paid \$1,550,995 for what was supposed to be a shipment of 1,341,250 yards of textiles; but instead of obtaining delivery of good textiles they actually received about \$40,000 worth of old rags.

These old rags were shipped under our AID program to Iran and paid for either directly or indirectly with money appropriated under our foreign aid program.

This fraudulent transaction took place in 1958 and 1959, and some of the individuals and companies responsible were indicted by a Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York on November 27, 1961; but this case has as yet not been brought to trial, and during this interval, our foreign aid officials have continued to carry the individual responsible for this fraud and his companies on the eligible list to handle foreign aid transactions. They were not suspended until May 23, 1964, or about 2 months after I began an inquiry into the case.

The names of the companies and individuals mentioned in the indictment of November 27, 1961, were:

Manoutchehr Aadal, Western National Fabrics Co.; Nasrollah Darab, Amerimpex Trading Co.; Faizollah Namdar, All American Fabrics Co.; Hassan Rafati, Worldwide Export Co.; Harfa Commercial Co.

As evidence of the seriousness of this fraudulent transaction which Mr. Aadal and his associates perpetrated on the American taxpayers, I quote from the text of the indictment as appearing on record in the District Court of the Southern District of New York:

1. From on or about the 1st day of January 1958, and continuously thereafter, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the southern district of New York, Manoutchehr Aadal, Nasrollah Darab, Faizollah Namdar, Hassan Rafati, Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., Worldwide Export Co. and Harfa Commercial Co., the defendants herein, and other persons to the grand jury unknown, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other to commit offenses against the United States to wit, to violate section 1001, title 18, United States Code, and section 121, title 49, United States Code, and to defraud an agency of the United States to wit, the International Cooperation Administration of the U.S. Department of State, in the exercise of governmental functions relating to the administration of the foreign economic assistance program.

5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that Manoutchehr Aadal and Hassan Rafati, the defendants, would cause to be shipped worthless rags, scraps and pound goods to Iran from the United States instead of the fine fabrics and textiles indicated in the said letters of credit.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that Manoutchehr Aadal and Hassan Rafati, the defendants, would make and cause to be made false statements in both shipper's export declarations and bills of lading, to the effect that fine fabrics and textiles were to be shipped to Iran, whereas, as alleged in paragraph 5 hereof, said defendants would ship and cause to be shipped worthless rags, scraps and pound goods.

Mr. Aadal, the key individual and the prime factor in this fraudulent transaction, is not even an American citizen. He entered this country in 1958 from Iran and promptly proceeded to establish a series of exporting companies. He then contacted the gullible administrators of our foreign aid program and about the same time applied for his American citizenship.

The State Department at first tried to belittle the taxpayers' loss under this fraudulent transaction by claiming that only \$58,685 of the approximately \$1½ million paid for these old rags represented foreign assistance funds. However, when pressed they admitted that while only \$58,685 was financed directly with foreign assistance funds the balance of the approximately \$1½ million fraudulent payment indirectly came from cash grants which we had made to Iran under our AID program.

In fiscal 1959 under our AID program we made grants to the Government of Iran of approximately \$3 million which in turn were deposited in the Bank Melli in Iran. Direct cash grants of another \$39 million were made to Iran during fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

The Bank Melli then paid the individuals named above the \$1½ million for the bunch of old rags which had been labeled as good textiles. There can be no question but that it was the American taxpayers' dollars which paid for this transaction even though it was done in this roundabout method.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence be incorporated in the RECORD:

First, I insert a letter received from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated March 2, 1964, in which they confirmed the payment of \$1,550,995 for a shipment of about \$40,000 worth of old rags which had been described as good textiles, along with a list of the names of the companies and individuals indicted on November 27, 1961. In this letter it will be noted that the State Department tried to claim that only \$58,685 of this amount was financed with American taxpayers' money.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letter of February 17 in which you asked for information about the extent of participation in the foreign aid program of certain enumerated companies and individuals. You expressed particular interest in a situation in which some of these companies and individuals allegedly defrauded the Government of approximately \$1.5 million by shipping \$40,000 worth of rags in place of good textiles.

Before passing to more detailed information, it may be noted that the situation to which your inquiry refers is now pending prosecutive action by the office of the U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, following indictments handed down by a Federal grand jury in 1961. It should also be noted that only a relatively small portion of the funds involved in the procurement were foreign assistance funds.

Files of this Agency disclose that the following firms were beneficiaries of letters of credit calling for the shipment of 1,341,250 yards of textiles in the amount of \$1,550,995:

All American Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Amerimpex Trading Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Harfa Commercial Co., 170 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Western National Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Worldwide Export Co., 79 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

These firms were trade styles set up and registered in New York City by Hassan Rafati, a citizen of Iran. Actual shipments were traced to the supplier and found to contain rags and pound goods, such goods having been purchased by Rafati and his associate, Manoutchehr Aadal.

Of the amount mentioned, only \$58,685 was financed with foreign assistance funds and the balance of the funds involved belonged to the Bank Melli, Iran. Three vouchers covering the foreign aid portion were forwarded to the FBI about August 1959 for review and use in court. These vouchers were paid on the following dates: September 30, 1958; October 13, 1958; and January 22, 1959.

A Federal grand jury, southern district of New York, returned a true bill on November 27, 1961, against the following:

Manoutchehr Aadal, Nasrollah Darab, Fadzollah Namdar, Hassan Rafati, Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., Worldwide Export Co., and Harfa Commercial Co.

Our files do not show that the remaining companies and individuals on your list were involved in the transactions on which prosecutive action is pending in New York, nor do our files disclose AID-financed shipments, other than those which are included in the pending case, for any of the named individuals and companies except Monarch Trading Co., Inc.

Monarch Trading Co. has appeared as supplier of a variety of products in hundreds of sales financed by AID and its predecessor agencies. Since, with one exception, these transactions are not known to have presented any problem, we assume that you may not be interested in having the transactions enumerated although, of course, the task could be undertaken if you wished to have such a compilation.

The one known problem involving Monarch Trading Co., 150 Broadway, New York, N.Y., results from a complaint by Shenh Yuh & Co., Ltd., Taiwan, that he ordered 200,000 pounds of coke tinplate waste waste from Monarch but received electrolytic tinplate waste waste (a less valuable product) instead. Shenh Yuh & Co., Ltd., agreed to a settlement of \$3,975.40 offered by Monarch on October 19, 1963. Our investigation of this matter is pending.

We trust that the foregoing supplies the information you wish, insofar as it is in the possession of this Agency. We shall, of course, be pleased to be of all possible further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG RAUPE,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Second, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter received from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated April 28, 1964, signed by Mr. David E. Bell, in which after further questioning they confirmed that all of the \$1,550,995 involved in the textile transaction was obviously paid for with American taxpayers' money. In this letter Mr. Bell confirms the \$42 million cash grants which were made to the Government of Iran and from which there can be but little question that payment was made for these old rags.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in answer to the inquiries regarding certain textile sales to Iran which you raised in your letters of February 17 and April 1, 1964, and in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 21, 1964.

In your letter of April 1 you correctly noted that a Federal grand jury returned an indictment against Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal and others in 1961. This matter has been in the hands of the Department of Justice since March 1959 when the ICA referred it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The case is now in the hands of the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York. We have been informed that all pretrial motions have been completed and that the case will be tried sometime later this year. We have referred your requests for a copy of the indictment and for verification of the charges on which the indictment is based to the Department of Justice. A copy of our letter to the Department of Justice is enclosed.

You also inquired whether—even though only \$58,686 out of the total of \$1,550,995 involved in the textile transactions is known to have been financed with foreign assistance funds—there is a possibility that the balance of the expenditures may have come from checks furnished Iran for general purposes by the U.S. Government. The only U.S. foreign assistance transactions which could have furnished funds for general purposes to Bank Melli are cash grants. During fiscal years 1958 and 1959, the period in which the allegedly fraudulent act took place, there was one transaction of this nature.

In fiscal year 1959, this Agency purchased Iranian currency equivalent in value to \$3 million from Bank Melli. The Iranian rials so purchased were used to help finance the local costs of joint Iranian-American development projects. The dollars received by Bank Melli in exchange for the local currency became a part of its foreign exchange holdings, indistinguishable from earnings from Iranian exports, which were available for sale to Iranian importers.

The dollars received through this Agency's purchase of rials in fiscal year 1959 constitute a very minor portion of the Government of Iran's foreign exchange, most of which was held by Bank Melli as Iran's largest bank. At that time Iran's export earnings, mostly in hard currencies, were at the equivalent of over \$700 million annually. There is therefore no way to answer your question because the dollars provided by the grant were indistinguishable from Iran's hard currency export earnings.

There were no similar cash grants in either fiscal year 1958 or fiscal year 1960. In August 1960, the Bank Markazi was founded as Iran's Central Bank and \$39 million of direct cash grants took place through that bank during fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962. This type of assistance was terminated in fiscal year 1962.

If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Next I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter from the Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated May 25, 1964,

signed by Mr. William O. Hall, assistant administrator, in which he states that the Agency had finally gotten around to suspending the firms and individuals involved in the indictment of November 27, 1961, from further participation in the handling of our AID goods.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1964.

Re Manoutchehr Aadal.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As I stated in my letter to you of May 5, 1964, the Agency undertook a review to determine the feasibility of disqualifying the firms with which Mr. Aadal is connected from participating in AID-financed transactions.

Our review of this matter has not yet been completed, but it has progressed to the point where we deemed it appropriate to suspend temporarily the firms and individuals indicted on November 30, 1961, and the firms apparently owned or controlled by Mr. Aadal. A copy of our letter notifying the affected firms and individuals is enclosed.

We are continuing our investigation of this matter and will continue to keep you apprised of developments as they occur.

We sincerely appreciate your calling this matter to our attention.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM O. HALL,
Assistant Administrator for Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the May 23, 1964, notice of suspension which the Department of State sent to the individuals and companies involved be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1964.

(Sent to all parties listed in (1) and (2) below).

You are hereby notified that effective immediately the persons described below are not eligible to be suppliers of commodities or services under any AID-financed contract and AID will not finance, directly or indirectly, any transaction to which any of such persons are parties:

(1) Manoutchehr Aadal; Nasrollah Darab; Faizollah Namdar; Hassan Rafati; All American Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Amerimpex Trading Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Harfa Commercial Co., 170 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Western National Fabrics Co., 277 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; and Worldwide Export Co., 79 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

(2) Monarch Trading Co., Inc., Monarch Processing Corp., American Asian Lines, Transasia Carrier Corp., Transasia Marine Corp., Transasia Steamship Co., Inc., Transasia Transportation Corp., all located at 150 Broadway, New York, N.Y., and all under the direction or control, directly or indirectly, of Manoutchehr Aadal.

This action is being taken to protect the interests of the U.S. Government and to assure the prudent use of AID funds and the integrity of AID operations. It is based on the facts set forth in the indictment filed November 30, 1961 against the persons named in paragraph (1) pursuant to which criminal prosecution of such persons is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern

District of New York. The facts set forth in the indictment, including the making of false statements to the U.S. Government, raise serious doubts concerning the present responsibility and reliability of the persons named in (1) and (2) above as participants in programs and transactions financed by AID. The suspension of all the above-named persons from eligibility to participate in AID-financed transactions will continue for a temporary period during which AID will further investigate the facts and determine what further action should be taken with respect to this suspension.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM O. HALL,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As a prospective applicant for American citizenship Mr. Aadal further displayed his contempt for our laws. The administration was extremely lax in taking appropriate steps to protect the American taxpayers in its business relationship with Mr. Aadal and his companies; as evidence of this laxity it should be noted that during the same period in which Mr. Aadal was selling these old rags to the Government as good textiles he was likewise negligent in paying his Federal income taxes. The records of the Treasury Department show that for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 his total tax delinquency amounts to \$464,234.03. This delinquency is broken down as follows:

Additional income taxes owed, 1958, \$251,242.28.

Additional income taxes owed, 1959, \$146,166.98.

Additional income taxes owed, 1960, \$66,824.77.

As of May 6, 1964, these taxes were still outstanding, and there appeared no evidence to indicate that the State Department was aware of the tax delinquencies of Mr. Aadal and his companies, nor is there any indication that the Treasury Department was aware of the fraudulent sale of old rags to the State Department. To make the situation more reprehensible neither agency seemed to be too much concerned until after I began making inquiries.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the May 6, 1964, letter of the Internal Revenue Service as signed by Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of February 17, 1964, requesting certain information in connection with the income tax matters of Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal, New York City, and other persons listed in the letter.

Mr. Aadal arrived in this country in 1958. Therefore, income tax returns were not due to be filed by him prior to that date.

Mrs. Violet Aadal married Manoutchehr Aadal in 1959. Prior to that time she filed income tax returns under her maiden name of Violet Bach.

Notices of Federal tax liens were filed against Mr. Aadal for additional 1958 income taxes and against Mr. and Mrs. Aadal for

additional 1959 and 1960 income taxes as follows:

Additional 1958 income taxes, \$251,242.28.

Additional 1959 income taxes, \$146,166.98.

Additional 1960 income taxes, \$66,824.77.

The taxpayers have filed an appeal which is pending before the Service.

We do not find a record of income tax returns for Hassan Rafati, Narsollah Darab, or Feizollah Namdar, having been filed in our Brooklyn or Manhattan district offices. Our information indicates that these persons have left this country.

With regard to the Western National Fabrics Co., Amerimpex Trading Co., All American Fabrics Co., World Wide Export Co., and Harfa Commercial Co., we have no record of returns having been filed. Our information indicates that these businesses were operated by Hassan Rafati, and ceased operations when he left the country.

Our information indicates that American Asia Lines, Inc., was incorporated in New York City in 1963; Transasia Carriers Corp., Transasia Transport Corp., and Transasia Steamship Co., were incorporated in Delaware in 1963. We are investigating to see whether income tax returns are due to be filed yet and, if so, whether they were filed and the address indicated on the returns.

The Monarch Trading Co. is an individual proprietorship of Manoutchehr Aadal and, as we previously reported to you, the business income or loss is reported in a schedule in the Aadal's individual returns.

The Monarch Trading Co., Inc., was incorporated in New York City in 1963. The Monarch Processing Co. was incorporated in New York County in 1962 and has been dormant.

We will write you further as soon as additional information is received from our district offices.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Notwithstanding this miserable record of Mr. Aadal and his companies in their dealings with the U.S. Government I regret to report that his farflung operations were just beginning to get started. For example, in recent months Mr. Aadal has branched out into the shipping business and with the consent of the Maritime Commission has purchased several secondhand ships and promptly thereafter has proceeded to arrange with the officials of our AID program to transport some of our AID supplies going to foreign countries. He was well on the road to success until the present inquiry started. It appears that no Government financing was involved in his purchase of these ships; however, on January 27, 1964, after having established a series of holding companies and after having purchased these ships he applied to the Maritime Commission, requesting operating differential subsidies in the name of the American Asia Lines, Inc., for a service which he was planning from the U.S. gulf and east coast to India and Pakistan.

On January 30, 1964, the Maritime Commission sent Mr. Aadal a copy of the form of application to be filed for such operating differential subsidies together with a request for more specific and detailed information. His attorney replied and indicated that since his client would not be eligible for U.S. citizenship until October 1964 the application would not

be submitted until after his citizenship was granted.

In a second letter on January 27, 1964, Mr. Aadal requested consideration that his company, the American Asia Lines, Inc., be appointed as general agent for the operation of Government-owned ships.

Our Government did use the services of some of these ships of Mr. Aadal's to transport foreign aid goods, and as evidence of this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 5, 1964, signed by Mr. Hall, assistant administrator of AID.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is a further report on the inquiries which we have undertaken as a result of the questions you have raised with David Bell and with me regarding Manoutchehr Aadal's relationships with AID.

We have determined that Mr. Aadal is president of a corporation called American Asia Lines, Inc., which operates ships owned by four affiliated companies. Each affiliated company owns one ship on which AID-financed cargoes have been carried in the last year. We have information indicating that Manoutchehr Aadal is vice president of the following affiliated companies:

Transasia Steamship Co., Inc.
Transasia Transport Corp.
Transasia Carriers Corp.

Violet Aadal, Manoutchehr Aadal's wife, is an officer of each of the three corporations listed above. We do not yet have information about the officers of the fourth company, Transasia Marine Corp., but we assume that the same pattern has been followed.

Our General Counsel is attempting to determine whether corporations which list among their shareholders and officers persons who have been indicted for alleged fraud against the Government should be disqualified from doing business with AID. Among other questions, he will have to determine whether a corporation must be penalized for acts of one or more of its principals taken independently of the corporation. He will also have to examine whether an indictment alone is sufficient to justify disqualification of the corporation or whether a more substantial indication of wrongdoing is required.

We have asked the Maritime Administration whether, in view of the foreign citizenship of some of the principals, the American registry of the ships owned by these corporations is appropriate.

We have also asked the Department of Commerce whether its records indicate that the Export Control Act was violated in the transaction which resulted in the indictment of Mr. Aadal and the effect of such violation, if it did occur, on Mr. Aadal's present involvement in foreign trade from the United States.

Mr. Bell and I appreciate your calling this matter to our attention. We shall, of course, continue to keep you informed as further developments occur.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM HALL,
Assistant Administrator for Adminis-
tration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question but that Mr. Aadal was on the verge of an expansive program for the handling of our foreign aid goods when the brakes were suddenly applied

after the State Department found that an inquiry was underway.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated March 17, 1964, and signed by Mr. J. W. Gulick, Deputy Maritime Administrator, be printed in the RECORD. In this letter Mr. Gulick gives a list of the various ships acquired by Mr. Aadal and his newly established companies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This letter has been prepared in reply to your letter of February 17, 1964, which was acknowledged by the Chief, Office of Government Aid on February 20, 1964. The information outlined below has been developed by a search of the records of this agency, and reflects the only transactions the Maritime Administration and its predecessors have had with the companies mentioned in your letter. For easy reference your inquiries are repeated before each reply.

1. The date of construction of the ship, the date the ship was purchased, the original construction cost, and the net amount paid by the company.

Present name, *Ponderosa*.
Previous names, *Tobias E. Stansbury*,
Taziarch, *Wanda*, *Kyra*, *Pondora*.
Year built, 1943.

Builder, Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.

Type, built for Government as a Liberty-type tanker but converted to a dry-cargo ship with private funds in 1957.

Original construction cost, \$2,247,157, which included \$60,000 for national defense features.

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to Tanker & Transport Corp. on June 1, 1948, for the statutory sales price of \$495,500. Since that time, it apparently has changed hands several times. Recent information shows that in April 1963 it was sold by its then owner, Epiphany Tankers Corp., to its present owner, Transasia Steamship Co., Inc., for \$282,500.

Present name, *Yukon*.
Previous names, *Natalie*, *Celestial*.
Year built, 1944.

Builder, Moore Drydock Co., Oakland, Calif.

Type, built for Government as a C-2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, \$3,579,103, which included \$127,000 for national defense features.

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to Sprague Steamship Co. on November 8, 1946, for the statutory sales price of \$957,818. Since that time this ship has apparently changed hands two or three times. Recent information shows that in January 1964 this ship was sold by its then owner, Intercontinental Transportation Co., Inc., to its present owner, Transasia Carriers Corp., for \$600,000.

Present name, *Bonanza*.
Previous names, *Carrier Dove*, *Agwicommet*,
Ines, *Jackson*.
Year built, 1946.

Builder, Consolidated Steel Corp., Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.

Type, built for Government as a C-2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, \$3,368,070 (no national defense features were included).

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship under the Merchant Ship

Sales Act of 1946 to Agwlines, Inc., on November 3, 1947, for the statutory sales price of \$980,870. Since that time this ship has apparently changed hands several times. Recent information shows that in May 1963, while registered in the name of Jackson Shipping Corp., it was sold at auction in the port of Aden to Walter E. Heller, mortgagee, for \$224,000. Although the records show that this ship is now named the *Bonanza* and is registered in the name of Transasia Carriers Corp., we have no information as to how it was purchased or the amount paid.

Present name, *Eldorado*.
Previous name, *Santa Teresa*.
Year built, 1940.

Builder, Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.

Type, built for Government as a C-2 dry-cargo ship.

Original construction cost, \$2,578,000 (no national defense features were included.)

Original owner, former Maritime Commission sold this ship with construction-differential subsidy under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to Grace Line Inc., upon its delivery by the shipbuilder, for \$1,358,000. Until recently this ship was operated by Grace Line under its operating-differential subsidy agreement. In October 1963 it was sold to Transasia Transport Corp. for \$415,000.

2. A complete report on any Government financing, in the form of either loans or loan guarantees, which has been made to assist Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal individually or any of his companies in the procurement of the above-named ships.

No Government financing in the form of either loans or loan guarantees has been made to assist either Mr. Manoutchehr Aadal individually or any of his companies in the procurement of these ships. Although these ships were sold with Government mortgages to the original owners, the mortgages were paid off prior to the sale of the ships to the "Transasia" companies.

You may be interested in knowing, however, that Mr. Aadal, in a letter dated January 27, 1964, requested operating-differential subsidy in the name of American Asia Lines, Inc., for a service from the U.S. Gulf and east coasts to India and Pakistan. In our reply of January 30, 1964, we enclosed a copy of the form of application for operating-differential subsidy, together with a request for more specific and detailed information. Up until this time, we have not received a reply from Mr. Aadal although his local attorney indicated that since his client will not be eligible for U.S. citizenship until October of 1964, this application will not be submitted until after citizenship is granted.

In another letter dated January 27, 1964, Mr. Aadal requested consideration for appointment of American Asia Lines, Inc., as general agent for the operation of Government-owned ships. Actually, the general agency program does not call for any more agents than we now have so that Mr. Aadal's request in this matter cannot be granted.

3. If there are any other ships which are not included in the above list please furnish similar information to that requested in 1 and 2, above.

Our records do not show that there are any ships, other than those mentioned above, owned individually by Mr. Aadal or any of his companies, including the Monarch Trading Co. With reference to the agencies mentioned in your letter, we have found that while shipping publications show American Asia Lines, Inc., of 150 Broadway, New York City, as agents for the four ships mentioned above, the American Bureau of Shipping record shows the operating agent to be the Penn Shipping Co., Inc., of 405 Park Avenue, New York City. The local attorney for the corporate group of companies of which Penn Shipping Co., Inc., is a member has stated however that Penn Shipping Co.,

Inc., no longer acts as agents for any of these ships.

For your further information there is enclosed a copy of a report we have just received from Dun & Bradstreet on Transasia Steamship Co., Inc.

4. A record of any arrangements which have been made with the Maritime Commission whereby these companies or any of their affiliates have been selected to transport American commodities under our AID programs.

The Maritime Administration is not authorized either to select or approve bookings or charters made by shipping agencies of the U.S. Government or any foreign governments. It has been reported, however, that the SS *Ponderosa* was chartered by an agency of the Government of India for the carriage of approximately 10,000 metric tons of ferromanganese for shipment in February 1964 from Vizagapatam to Baltimore. It is our understanding that this shipment was made pursuant to a Public Law 480 title III barter agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the United States.

The American Asia Lines, Inc., advertises sailings from the U.S. Atlantic ports to ports in India and Pakistan on the SS *Eldorado*, SS *Yukon*, SS *Ponderosa*, and SS *Bonanza*. It is therefore, possible that these vessels have handled parcels of U.S. Government financed commodities sponsored by the Agency of International Development of the State Department and by the Department of Agriculture under titles I, II, and IV of Public Law 480.

I regret that the Maritime Administration does not have more detailed information on the carryings of AID cargoes by Mr. Aadal's companies. If additional information is required, however, you may wish to contact the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, which administer the shipments of AID commodities.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. GULICK,
Deputy Maritime Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Immediately following this insertion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the July 1, 1964, issue of the New York Times entitled "Four-Ship Fleet Being Liquidated."

In this article the writer, Mr. Callahan, calls attention to the fact that these various shipping companies, apparently after being denied further government assistance and cargo, are on the verge of being either liquidated or sold in bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]

FOUR-SHIP FLEET BEING LIQUIDATED—IRANIAN ORGANIZER OF LINE IS UNDER INDICTMENT HERE

(By John P. Callahan)

A 38-year-old Iranian who organized an American-flag steamship line last year while under a 2-year-old indictment for fraudulent exports said yesterday that he was liquidating the four-ship fleet of American Asia Lines, Inc.

While the ship executive, Manoutchehr Aadal, now vice president of the company, disclosed plans for meeting obligations in excess of \$1,990,000 to major oil companies, stevedores, ship chandlers and ship crews, the Federal District Court here was processing another charge of fraud. Mr. Aadal was arrested on Friday for having allegedly falsified bills of lading on a shipment of steel

for Pakistan. He is on bail of \$50,000 on that charge.

Two of the four cargo ships—the *Yukon* and the *Eldorado*—are in port. The *Bonanza* is due here July 7 with cargo from Far East ports, and the *Ponderosa* was "arrested" under lien yesterday in Bombay, where one of 28 seamen members of the Seafarers International Union has filed suit for wages from May 4 to June 26.

LOADED SHIP AT ANCHOR

The *Eldorado* is at anchor here with about 7,000 tons of general cargo that was loaded early this month for Karachi, Pakistan. Other officials of the company ordered the vessel back after it was halfway to its destination, Mr. Aadal said. The *Yukon* is tied up at pier 17, Hudson River, because of an action for crew's wages filed by the Seafarers Union.

Mr. Aadal said the largest creditor seeking satisfaction was the Monarch Trading Co., of which he has been the chief officer since he arrived here from Iran in 1958 and organized the company to specialize in exporting agricultural products, chemicals, and steel to India and Pakistan.

The others, including oil, stevedoring, chandler and ship repair companies, are owed \$500,000, Mr. Aadal said, and about \$700,000 is due on ship mortgages.

American Asia now is operating agent for the four ships. Each of the vessels is a separate corporation owned by U.S. citizens, including Mr. Aadal's three children, whose interests are in trusteeship.

Mr. Aadal said the "demise" of the enterprise was precipitated last month when the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Commerce declared it ineligible to carry foreign-aid cargo, "because of the indictment against me pending since 1961."

Mr. Aadal said that if the creditors did not "go along" with his efforts to sell the four ships, "we will go into bankruptcy proceedings." He added: "We must make arrangements with the creditors through liquidation, and we hope they will go along with us."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When we consider how harsh Uncle Sam can be in collecting a small obligation from the average John Doe who may be a few dollars delinquent in his income taxes or in a payment on his FHA or VA mortgage it is hard to understand how such a glaringly fraudulent transaction as outlined above could be allowed to continue and even to be supported by agencies of the U.S. Government.

When we stop to think about the scandals we have had, in connection with salad oil, the Billie Sol Estes case, and others, I most respectfully suggest that the Department of Justice should forget some of its political activities and begin to call to justice those who are responsible for violating our laws.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day the majority leader indicated what the schedule would be like for this

week. I thought perhaps he would like to amplify his remarks so that we might have a pretty firm idea of the bills that will come up in due course within the next few days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I had anticipated, after discussing the matter with him, that we would take up the bill on potato futures and stockpiling on Tuesday, but I find, because of negotiations now in process, that it will not be possible to take up the stockpiling bill tomorrow. Therefore, it is anticipated that the bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges will be considered.

In that respect, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 911, S. 332, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

PROHIBITION OF TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 332) to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, no action will be taken on the pending bill this evening, but it will be the pending business and the first order of business tomorrow.

In place of the stockpiling bill, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, it has been decided to call up Calendar No. 1067, Senate Resolution 337, to provide disclosure of financial interest and to enumerate certain prohibited activities; also, Calendar No. 1089, Senate Resolution 338, amending rule 25 of the standing rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

After those matters are disposed of, it is anticipated that the next order of business will be Calendar No. 1111, S. 2642, a bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Action on that bill will be followed by Calendar No. 1123, H.R. 11380, the so-called foreign aid bill.

It is anticipated and hoped that there will be reported to the floor of the Senate during this week appropriation bills covering the District of Columbia, the legislative branch of the Government, and perhaps the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator anticipate that on Tuesday there will be before the Senate for consideration the bill relating to trading in Irish potato fu-

tures, both of the rules resolutions, and the antipoverty bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not the foreign aid bill on Tuesday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe the Senate could get through with all those matters tomorrow. The best we could do would be to lay down the so-called anti-poverty bill tomorrow night because, under an agreement reached some 2 weeks ago, the minority has until midnight of the 21st to file its report. Therefore, the first time we could get the foreign aid bill before us would be when the Senate convened on Wednesday. My guess would be that very likely the foreign aid bill would not come up until Friday or perhaps Saturday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it will follow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; unless an appropriation bill came in between, that might not take too long.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The probabilities are that the foreign aid bill will not be reached until Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the way it looks now, if the Senator will allow for flexibility. It might be Thursday, but I do not think so.

Mr. MORSE. The probabilities are that it might not be reached until Monday, but Friday or Saturday would be my guess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall see.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps the majority leader would like to give us his present plan with respect to the bill to implement the coffee agreement, and whether or not he sees that in the picture for this week, or is it further along?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I could give a definitive answer to the distinguished minority leader, but, to put it mildly, the situation is in a state of flux.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator will do everything he can, but I think it is important to consider the coffee agreement as soon as possible. As Senators know, we are in conference this week with our friends from Latin America in connection with the OAS matter. I am sure that the coffee agreement is going to be on the lips of many of them. Speaking only for myself, and no one else, it would greatly strengthen the persuasiveness of the American delegation at that conference if we could at least give some assurance that it will come up, and be voted either up or down, because to them this is a matter of economic life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is, however, beset with difficulties that are real and practical.

Mr. MORSE. That is true, but we may as well face them and have them behind us, rather than leave our friends from Latin America suspended in the air.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, one of the reasons for the delay is that the leadership wishes to discuss this matter with the

distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who will be in charge of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Prior to the time the Senate recessed for the convention in California, it runs in my mind that we discussed the possibility of taking up the beef import measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that will be brought up at the appropriate moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some time later?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

THE RIOTS IN HARLEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel, as a Senator from New York, that while it is not a Federal problem, I should have a word to say about violence in the streets of New York. Such violence is no way in which to solve whatever grievances exist either in Harlem or any other community.

I am certain that every responsible official and civic leader is deeply shocked by these events. Such extremist actions do not promote freedom or justice; rather, they serve to inflame passions and incite racial hatred. Only hate-mongers, racists, and demagogues can benefit from such demonstrations of lawlessness and anarchy.

Legal remedies exist against any alleged police brutality, both under Federal and State laws. If such legal remedies are inadequate, they should be strengthened. Nothing will be solved by extremist appeals to lawlessness and violence. Every possible step must be taken to restore order and to bring reason and moderation to this situation.

I have been asked whether I felt there should be Federal intervention. My answer to that query is "Not at this time." The police force of the city of New York should be able to handle the situation. I am sure that the officials of the city of New York feel as deeply concerned about this situation as do I. But I cannot condemn in strong enough terms the use of violence or lawlessness to bring about any ends in this free country.

U.S. CONSUMER PAYS THE PRICE OF COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, H.R. 8864 is entitled "An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes." That is a long title.

Its real purpose can be stated more briefly, and in shorter words. Its real purpose is to push the price of coffee up, and to hold it up. That is the sum and substance of this legislation.

The basic principle of the International Coffee Agreement can be described in simple terms. Essentially, it is an arrangement to control the price of coffee throughout the world, by limiting the quantities that will be permitted to be sold. Under this arrangement the countries that produce the coffee and ship it abroad accept quotas on their exports; that is, limits on the quantity of coffee that each may ship and sell to

other countries—but of course by doing so, these exporting countries receive higher prices and thus, more money for less coffee.

It is the well-known old principle of pushing up the price by restricting the supply on the market.

If such a thing were done domestically, we would call it a monopoly or trust or restraint of trade and vigorously prosecute those involved under the antitrust law. In this case, governments have lent the sanction of law and thus the color of respectability to it.

Now, what is involved? Who will pay the cost of this scheme? The consuming countries, of course. And although there are other countries which import coffee, the United States is the most seriously affected by far. Actually, this country each year consumes more than half of all the coffee exported throughout the world. We import over 3 billion pounds of coffee a year. We drink 450 million cups a day. That is equal to 2½ cups per day for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

How much will this agreement cost us? Mr. President, each penny-a-pound increase in the price of green coffee costs this country about \$30 to \$35 million a year.

Defenders of the treaty argue, of course, that it is designed to protect consumers as well as producers. Unfortunately, the terms of the agreement with coffee producing nations and the testimony at the hearing do not support that argument. Article 27, paragraph (1), of the agreement states, in part:

The members * * * agree on the desirability of operating the agreement in a manner such that the real income derived from the export of coffee could be progressively increased so as to make it consonant with their needs for foreign exchange to support their programs for social and economic progress.

Then, in paragraph (2) of article 27, the agreement states:

The members agree on the necessity of assuring that the general level of coffee prices does not decline below the general level of such prices in 1962.

In other words, the agreement sets a floor, but not a ceiling on coffee prices. There is a bland statement of platitudes in article 1 of the agreement, which refers to "equitable prices," but nowhere in the treaty is there any definition of that term, and there are no provisions to carry out that objective.

In May of last year, Secretary of State Rusk wrote:

The objective of the new International Coffee Agreement is to stop the long-term decline in revenues from coffee exports by stabilizing prices at a level no lower than the general level of coffee prices in 1962.

The Presidential message urging House enactment of this implementing legislation, H.R. 8864, stated:

The purpose of the agreement, which I fully endorse, is to check the disastrous decline in coffee prices that began in 1955, by holding a floor under these prices at the general level prevailing in 1962, and to bring stability to coffee markets by preventing major fluctuations in price.

The report on the agreement itself by the Committee on Foreign Relations said:

The main purpose of the agreement is to prevent a further decline in the world price of coffee which has dropped more than 50 percent since 1954, the year of the all-time highest price.

In the phrasing of all these platitudinous assurances, it will be noted that the emphasis is on stopping the decline, preventing the price from going any lower, and in stabilizing the price. Little or nothing is openly admitted about the desire to boost the price.

Yet the fact is that we have already learned from experience how this mechanism can be used as a new kind of rocket propulsion fuel, to send the price of coffee into orbit.

On May 21, 1963, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the treaty. Our instrument of ratification of the treaty was deposited in December of 1963. Immediately, the price of coffee started to climb. Making comparison on the basis of the wholesale price of Santos 4's, the most commonly quoted type of Brazilian coffee, for the full year 1963, the average price was 34.11 cents per pound. The price of coffee had advanced just slightly during the last months of 1963 and averaged 37.45 cents per pound in December.

But after the U.S. ratification of the treaty was made formal, in January the price averaged 44.83 cents, a gain of a full 20 percent in a single month. Then in February and March it went up some more, reaching a high of about 51 cents at one time in March. It has now receded slightly, but not very much.

Altogether, the increase has amounted to about 50 percent—17 cents a pound above the 1963 level to the peak reached so far. And we have no proof that we have seen the maximum yet.

Supposedly, there were built-in safeguards to protect the consuming countries from this kind of price gouging. Supposedly our representation in the International Coffee Council, which has its headquarters in London, would permit us to stop prices from skyrocketing. The majority report of the Finance Committee states:

The interests of the United States are protected by the fact that it will hold a minimum of 400 votes out of the total of 1,000 consumer votes in the International Coffee Council, the governing body of the agreement, and will also be a member of the executive board. Since practically all important decisions, such as adoption of the budget, establishment of the quotas, or the production control program, require a two-thirds vote of the consumers and producers voting separately, the United States holds sufficient votes to prevent actions which might be considered adverse to our policy interests, to our business community, or to the American consumer.

Despite these assurances, we have found that our voting strength will not protect us. Last fall, there began to be received the first firm indications of serious damage to the Brazilian coffee crop. It became clear that the price would increase unless prompt action was taken to increase available supplies of coffee on the market by increasing the quotas.

The International Coffee Council considered the matter. The other consuming countries voted unanimously with the United States for at least a moderate increase in quotas, to relieve the upward speculative pressure on the coffee market.

But the agreement provides that no changes in quotas can be made unless the consuming countries, and the producing countries, voting separately, each approve the change by a two-thirds vote. Of course, the producing countries were not displeased at the price rise. A vote for increased quotas would have checked the price increase; for the producing countries, that would have been a vote against self-interest. At the time there was great pressure on them to approve increased quotas, because the United States had not yet formally adhered to the Organization, and there was doubt that this country would go along. Coffee-producing interests were afraid that the United States might, after all, reject this legislation, or withdraw from the Organization. In that case the whole proposal would collapse, since the United States accounts for more than half of all coffee imports.

On that ground, a number of the coffee-producing countries were persuaded to vote against self-interest, and go along with the proposed increase in quotas. Even so, the increase was defeated, since it received less than a two-thirds vote of the producing countries.

Surely nothing could reveal more clearly our lack of power in such an international conclave. We had been delivered into the hands of our antagonists—insofar as fixing the price of coffee is concerned, that is. They had the votes, they had the control, and we had to accept their decision. That first test of the agreement showed clearly that the coffee-producing countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia can and will dominate the market.

It is true that about 3 months later, in February of this year, after the price had already climbed about 10 or 15 cents, the Council was willing to vote an increase in quotas. Even then, we must remember, that action was taken in part to ward off the danger that the United States might after all not adopt this implementing legislation. This bill was then still before the Senate and had not yet been acted upon, and prices were increasing at an unparalleled rate. There was nervousness among coffee-producing countries that the American housewife would see through the whole scheme, rise in revolt, and induce this body to block our participation and thus bring the whole project to a grinding halt. On that basis the producing countries, perhaps reluctantly, voted quota increases.

It may be that that will be the last quota increase they will vote voluntarily. Once we have approved this legislation, our last major defense will have been given away.

What does this particular bill do? It does two major things. It provides that we may require certificates as to country of origin for all coffee imported here. Second, it provides that we may limit, reduce, or stop altogether any imports of

coffee from countries which have not adhered to the International Coffee Agreement.

The purpose of these two powers is to enable us to help to enforce its control over the world coffee market by the International Coffee Organization. They have no other purpose. When quotas had been set, we would help to enforce the quotas—whether we agreed with them or not—by rejecting coffee imports from any country that might secede from the International Coffee Organization, or from any individual producer in a member country who might try to ship us coffee without securing an export license or certificate from his own government. In effect, the United States would become an enforcing arm of a world coffee cartel, devoted to raising the price of coffee and keeping it high. And since we are by far the largest importing country, we would be the chief enforcing arm of the cartel. That is what this bill provides.

We are told that our attitude toward this bill is a reflection of our sympathies for the poor people of Latin America. Possibly, the American housewife would not mind paying a little more for her coffee if the additional money would really go to help relieve starvation and suffering. But there is persuasive evidence that this money would not go to the poor in Latin America. As the minority views on the bill well state:

The chief beneficiaries of the International Coffee Agreement are government treasuries which levy heavy taxes on exports, coffee speculators, and a few large landowners, and the American housewife will pay the bill.

It is not even a program to help the poor peasant, but rather a form of foreign aid, disguised to deceive the unsuspecting public.

When the agreement itself was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said very candidly:

It seems to me that to make an argument that this agreement is in the interest of the consumers is something less than frank. It is really in the interests of our national foreign policy, isn't it? * * * It is in the interest of our foreign policy like our foreign aid bill.

If each penny increase in the price of coffee costs the American consumer \$30 to \$35 million, then the increase of 15 to 17 cents a pound that we have experienced since last fall is costing American consumers well over \$500 million annually. It is as if we had levied a sales tax on the American housewife, and had then taken that revenue and handed it over to the coffee-producing countries. The difference is that this kind of foreign aid does not have to be approved in detail by the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate.

Neither does it necessarily go where it is most needed. It does not go to the poor who need it, nor for capital investment which at least would build up the economies of those countries. Instead it goes to the large landholders, who may use it for conspicuous consumption at home, or who may secrete it in numbered and anonymous accounts in Swiss banks; or it goes to the government of the

exporting country which levies its tax on coffee thus exported.

Mr. President, we are told that we are under a moral obligation to pass this implementing legislation, since we have already approved the International Coffee Agreement. It is true that the Senate was persuaded to give a form of advice and consent to that treaty. I refer to it as "a form of advice and consent" because it was clearly stated and we were clearly told at the time that our ratification would not be deposited and that the treaty would not be binding upon us until Congress had had an opportunity to pass upon this implementing legislation. Now we are told that since the Senate approved the treaty, we are committed, we are obligated, and that it would be unthinkable for us to reject this legislation at this late date.

In this matter as in so many others, Congress has been led down the primrose path by promises from the other end of the avenue. I think the story can best be told in the words of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] in his individual views on the bill:

We were told by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee last year when we were considering the formal coffee treaty that even if we did approve it, it would not go into effect or be binding upon us until the Congress passed the legislation now before us. I am sure the able and honorable Senator from Arkansas, who made that pledge, did so in complete and utter good faith. Secretary Rusk, also a highly honorable man, made a similar pledge to the minority leader. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 7, p. 9126.) We assumed, therefore, that the ratification of the treaty would not be deposited unless and until the implementing legislation was passed.

The Finance Committee was delayed in considering the implementing legislation in the fall because of hearings on the long delayed tax bill. But in December our committee squared away to consider the measure. I shall never forget the hectic morning when the State Department started off by urging speedy hearings on the coffee agreement and then within an hour urged just as strenuously that action be withheld until after the tax bill was passed. I do not blame anyone for this. Assistant Secretary Dutton manfully took the blame for this, but it was obviously not his fault as he was merely the messenger. Then, at the suggestion of members, the chairman asked a high authority whether if we withheld action as requested, there would be any danger that the treaty would be deposited and hence go into effect even though no implementing legislation had been passed. He reported to us that he had been assured that this would not be done. The committee, therefore, felt it safe to postpone the hearings on coffee and get on with the tax bill. No sooner was this done, however, than individuals on the committee, of whom I was one, were informed that, due to the pressure of time, the State Department would deposit the treaties after all. I was asked if I had an individual objection and replied that I did not regard myself, as one Member of the U.S. Senate, as being sufficiently important to alter the policy of the U.S. Government, but that I thought the Finance Committee had been treated cavalierly to say the least and that promises had been made which had not been fulfilled.

Mr. President, it is not too late for us to stop and think. This may be our last chance, but we still do have this chance to pull back from this dangerous and

harmful agreement before it is too late. It has well been said:

If H.R. 8864 is adopted there can be but one result. Prices will remain high and continue to penalize the domestic consumer. A solid floor has been built, but nothing has been done to set an upward limit.

The time has arrived when we had best begin to look after our American interests, instead of trying to assume the burdens of surplus coffee producers in many nations.

This bill should be defeated.

To this viewpoint, this Senator wholeheartedly subscribes.

This outcome as provided in the bill is not unexpected. It was forecast by those who voted against ratification of the treaty last year. This Senator is among those who did so. At that time, we felt it ill-advised and against the best interests of America, with her adverse gold flow, and against the interests of our citizens and the consuming public. The provisions of the pending bill bear us out in our fears.

The administration advocated and forced a tax cut earlier this year. But the pending bill is the equivalent of an increase in taxes levied by coffee producing countries upon the large and widely spread coffee drinking population of our 50 States. It is a bill which vests in the foreign nation cartel members the power to retain and even increase that tax and to pocket the proceeds for themselves.

This is not a good bill. It is a bad bill. It should be defeated.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each year the University of Nebraska welcomes back its graduates to the campus in Lincoln for an alumni roundup.

Two of the speakers at this year's reunion on June 13 concerned themselves with the problem of providing higher education for the years immediately ahead when campuses across the Nation are becoming increasingly crowded.

Dr. Clifford Hardin, chancellor of the university, and Mr. Charles Thone, president of its alumni association, discussed this subject in thoughtful terms, expressing concern about the challenge we face, yet confidence that the challenge will be met.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD the remarks by Chancellor Hardin and President Thone.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN

As I visit with you today, I want to do so as a Nebraskan who is proud of his State, proud of his neighbors, and grateful for the privilege of speaking to the alumni of this great university on behalf of a large group of colleagues at the university who are "Cornhuskers" by deliberate choice, and who intend to continue to be "Cornhuskers" in the long and interesting years ahead.

We are thrilled to be associated with great Nebraska builders like Sterling McCaw, George Cook, and Peter Klewit—and we are proud of all of our great and distinguished alumni wherever they may live and work.

If I were to use a text today, I would use a statement sometimes quoted by engineers: "You can move forward and still be bumped or trampled because you did not move fast enough."

The April issue of a little publication called News Front, which bills itself as management's news magazine, contains an article entitled "Knowledge—New U.S. Industry." Here are a few quotations from this article:

"It is not generally realized how far the United States has gone in the transition from a production-oriented system to a science-based, or idea-oriented economy.

"Education now generates at least one-fifth of the U.S. growth rate.

"The 'knowledge industry' accounts for nearly one-third of the entire economy, and is growing twice as fast.

"U.S. business spends \$17 billion yearly to educate its personnel, or one-third as much as is spent on the Nation's public and private school system.

"More than one-fourth of the Nation is engaged in education (51 million students and 2 million teachers).

"Investment in education has increased the output of the economy and the income of those educated equal to a return on investment of about 10 percent, according to the Chase Manhattan Bank."

And then they refer to a paragraph in Clark Kerr's Godkin lectures when he says: "We are just now perceiving that knowledge may be the most powerful single element in our culture. What the railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile for the first half of this century may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry."

News Front also quotes from Prof. Theodore Schultz: "The contribution of education to economic growth between 1929 and 1959 exceeded that of physical capital."

Following this series of citations, the article then editorializes on their meaning as follows: "The knowledge revolution is also changing the economic geography of the Nation. The dominant 'growth' institutions of the future will be, not the factories, but the Nation's intellectual organizations—the research corporations, industrial laboratories, experimental stations, and universities.

"These, in turn, attract industry. This is clearly shown by one of the Nation's most research-oriented industries—defense. Three States—California, New York, and Massachusetts—have been able to claim nearly 60 percent of all military research contracts, because, according to Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, they are also centers of learning.

But it is not only research that follows this pattern, for these same three States are now receiving nearly 40 percent of all military prime contracts for production.

This brief review provides part of the background against which I wish to discuss the future of this university. There are a few other items that need to be added.

It has become almost trite to talk about the population increase. Even so, few realize the magnitude of it or the probable results within a society such as our own or on the relations among nations. It is now estimated that one-fourth of the people who have ever lived on the face of the earth are still alive. Within the United States it is now suggested that if, by some miracle, size of family could be reduced immediately to two children per family, our own population would still double by the year 2000.

There is also the explosion in new knowledge. If we were to attempt to select a date for which we could say that since then more scientific knowledge has been discovered and recorded than in all previous time, it is probable that that date would fall in the decade of the 1940's. I would be so reckless as to forecast that by 1985

we shall have added more scientific knowledge than exists in 1964.

Thanks to the efforts of many able and interested people, both within the university and outside, the institution has been able to make substantial progress during the past 10 years. Yet we know that whatever has happened in the past decade must be completely dwarfed by events of the next if Nebraska is to grow and prosper, and if she is to hold her own among the States.

All schools and colleges will be caught up in this onrush of events, but the impact in the next 10 years will be greatest at the college and university level. In Nebraska this institution, because of its size, because it is the only institution with doctorate programs, because of the professional colleges and the commitment to research and service, and because it is the single State university, must play the key role.

Let us turn first to the undergraduates.

All of you can think of an excellent liberal arts college that has an enrollment somewhere between 700 and 1,300 students. You can visualize also the campus, its buildings, the faculty, and the other things that go with that kind of college. If you will do this, perhaps you will then be able to appreciate more clearly the magnitude of the task here. We've added the equivalent of one of these colleges in each of the past 3 years, and we shall be expected to add another on the average in each of the next 10 years. Remember, the increase in birth rate which occurred following World War II will affect the colleges for the first time this fall.

Think, if you will, of 60 additional faculty members for each 1,000 students, office space for them, new classrooms and laboratories, land for additional intramural athletics and recreational facilities, dormitory space and dining facilities for 1,000 more students each year, a new location for fraternities and sororities—all of this while we continue to upgrade, remodel, or replace space for such existing programs as music, mechanical engineering, architecture, the biological sciences, physical education for women, physics, and English.

Now let us add to this undergraduate program comparable changes in our graduate and professional schools and colleges. More than a fifth of our students are now working for an advanced degree.

The National Science Foundation has announced a new policy of attempting to facilitate the development of 10 to 12 additional scientific research centers throughout the country—centers with faculty and facilities to do some of the things now being done at the existing top dozen such centers. We hope and believe that the University of Nebraska can be one of these new centers. Such a goal is within reach if the citizens of the State wish to make sufficient effort. And while the dollar costs will seem high, the possible returns in terms of the economic and cultural development of the State are enormous, if not fantastic.

We have a strong faculty, and it is improving each year—thanks to a group of able people who stuck it out when things were tougher than they are now, to a much improved salary scale, and to the relatively new regents professorship program which was born in the alumni association and which is going a long way in insuring our future academic excellence.

Our administrative group will rank with the very best to be found in any university anywhere—in terms of competence and imagination.

We are fortunate that the State chose to concentrate on the development of a single State university in contrast to nearly all of our neighbors.

The reputation of our graduates is excellent. For example, we are still among the top 25 universities in numbers of graduates listed in "Who's Who in America."

We have this excellent structure which provides a central facility and focus for our rapidly developing program of continuing education and which, in turn, is helping to relate the university's total resource more directly to the needs of the State.

We have these things and many others—a solid foundation for further building—for the further building of a university to be of greater service to the people who support it. This is an important point. A university must never be considered as an end in itself, but rather as an institution that enables a people to do things that they want or need that could not be so well provided otherwise.

Most of you know this, but it is important that you know that we also realize it. What we are proposing here, therefore, should be considered part of a total program for making Nebraska an even more satisfying place to live. And somehow I feel that we in Nebraska have the ability to accomplish almost anything that we want—if we want it enough.

Profs. Robert Manley and James Olson are preparing a history of the University of Nebraska to be published in connection with the university's centennial in 1969. Yesterday they visited with our centennial committee about some of the material that has been collected. Dr. Manley reported that news stories and articles throughout the Nation in the 1890's and the early 1900's invariably included Nebraska in any list of the six or eight most distinguished institutions. They would mention two or three Ivy League schools—Michigan, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. There was frequent local reference to Nebraska as "the best in the West." And, indeed, we were one of the early members of the Association of American Universities—the university that provided the advanced graduate program (first graduate college in public university in United States; first in any university west of the Mississippi).

I asked Dr. Manley whether this was the result of the efforts of a few able people; or was there evidence that this prestige was understood and strongly desired by the citizenry. He states that the evidence is unmistakable—the people wanted that kind of university and insisted on having it; they were inordinately proud of Bessey, Barbour, Brace, Fling, Edgren, Avery, and many others.

I then asked him if he could pinpoint the time when the institution began to lose momentum. He said definitely that the pace slowed in the 3 or 4 years following 1910. There was great debate on whether the downtown campus should be moved. During the years of this debate, many important decisions were postponed until the location issue was settled. Momentum appeared to have been lost and gradually a fervent desire to excel in every way gave way to a willingness to settle for something less—even, in some instances so the record shows, to apology.

I hope future historians will record that somewhere in the fifties the psychology began to change and by 1964 once again Nebraskans were on the move, that they were determined to excel—and excel they did.

I hope that Nebraskans will insist that they want in their State university a significant share of the Nation's most distinguished scholars and scientists. That we will insist also that our other colleges and universities prosper and be permitted to make their maximum contribution. I hope that we will insist that all Nebraskans be provided opportunity to develop their talents to the full extent of their respective abilities.

If we do these things, I believe the results will be most rewarding. I believe that we shall find ourselves greatly increasing our average productivity. I believe that we shall be supplying quality service to the other States, to other parts of the world, and to ourselves in greater amounts than we have

ever dreamed. We already have some excellent examples of this type of activity. We have Nebraska contracting companies and architectural firms operating throughout this country and abroad which are successfully competing with the very best anywhere. We have insurance companies which are among the best. They are selling insurance, to be sure, but they are also selling excellent financial management. These are examples of services provided from Nebraska which help to enrich our own economy.

We can do more of these things if we want to—if we can rekindle that spirit of pride and burning zeal that we seemed to have possessed a half century ago.

It is the persons in this room more than any other group who must take the lead. In so doing we must realize that just moving forward is not enough—that it is possible to make progress but so slowly that we can get trampled from behind.

Tomorrow is going to be vastly different from yesterday. There is great urgency and even greater opportunity. Let us move forward rapidly enough to be leaders in whatever we attempt.

REMARKS OF CHARLES THONE, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

The University of Nebraska Alumni Association does me a great honor by allowing me to serve as its president. I am deeply appreciative and accept the office in the effort to make some contribution in repayment of the great debt I personally owe to higher education and to the university particularly.

This annual alumni roundup is an appropriate occasion for all of us to consider our obligations to education. It has been an important friend to me, as I know it has to you.

This is a case of a friend indeed is a friend in need.

Higher education today is in need. The gale winds surrounding the postwar population explosion threaten to extinguish the lamp of opportunity which for so long beckoned our young people—at the very moment in time when they most need the light of learning.

Only a few facts are needed to pinpoint the problem.

In the past 2 years, elementary and secondary school enrollment in Nebraska has increased by more than 20,000.

Next fall, nearly 24,000 students are expected in the State's 12th-grade classes alone, representing an increase of some 20 percent over this year.

Nearly half of our current crop of high school seniors will attend college within the State's borders. The going-to-college rate in Nebraska not only stands at 45 percent, but increases by nearly 2 percent with each passing year. And by adding technical and vocational schools—and a most generous and sympathetic understanding in this area is essential—the post-high-school education ratio for Nebraska's graduating young people rises to 54 percent.

The university's growth pattern, showing an increase for the sixth consecutive year, and a record high of 11,450 students last fall, is being duplicated in higher learning institutions throughout the State. At its current rate of growth, 20,000 students roaming the NU campus by the early 1970's looms as a distinct probability.

At Wayne State College, enrollment demands have already forced a limitation on out-of-State students for the first time.

To those of us with firsthand appreciation of its value—and I speak as a young man who went from a one-room country schoolhouse to a high school staffed with a couple of exceptional teachers—through our law school here at the university, higher education is not only an old friend, but one of

our very best. And right now, here in Nebraska, it's a friend that urgently needs our top-priority interest and active support, our effective support.

The responsibility extends to all the people, not merely their leaders. We need additional facilities. We need more teachers, perhaps teachers most of all. We need space. We need money.

To ignore these needs is to ignore our children and to ignore our children is to ignore the future of our State. The future is our promise to our children and to our children's children.

The young people of Nebraska want, deserve, and must have the chance to meet and get acquainted with our old friend, education.

The challenge is there. The question is, shall we meet it? When we consider our obligations to this longtime friend, I am confident we will.

It is a mistake to consider that education is an end to be achieved. Education is not a destination; it is an endless road we travel all the days of our lives.

NEBRASKA PLANNING OBSERVANCE OF CENTENNIAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was 160 years ago that President Jefferson authorized the Lewis and Clark Expedition to explore and report the assets of the newly acquired Louisiana Territory. Since this time, the area which was to become Nebraska has played a significant role in the history of the Louisiana Purchase and the West. From the 1820's until the 1840's the future Nebraska was considered to be a part of the Great American Desert where little would grow and where the opportunities for human life were bleak.

In the 1840's, John C. Fremont and his band of explorers crossed Nebraska and sent a report to the Secretary of War regarding his explorations. Subsequently, the Secretary suggested that the area be called Nebraska, based on the Indian word meaning "shallow river." Thus, just 120 years ago, Congress first considered a bill to create a new political unit west of the Missouri River. This new area was to be known as the Territory of Nebraska, but due to the political issues of the time this movement came to naught.

This period of the 1830's and 1840's had great importance for the history of Nebraska and the West, because it was during this time that the basis was laid for future settlement and development. The early pathfinders established the routes which would permit the extensive movement of people and enable the East to tap the rich trade possibilities of the Northwest and the West to make known to settlers its vast mineral and agricultural resources. As we all know, Mr. President, the result was the development of the famous overland routes of the Oregon and Mormon Trails. Both of these routes converged in the present State of Nebraska and followed the Platte Valley until they reached its western border where they separated. Undoubtedly, these trails greatly facilitated the settlement of Nebraska and hastened its territorial organization.

After Congress abandoned the Nebraska territorial bill in 1844, it was 10 years before the matter of organizing the Ter-

ritory again presented itself to the Congress—this time in the form of the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854. After 5 months of debate, the measure was passed and the Territory of Nebraska was created which extended between 40° and 49° North up to the Canadian border. The area on the east from the Missouri River extended to the Rocky Mountain Divide on the west. This new Territory embraced all or substantial parts of the area now occupied by the States of North Dakota, Wyoming, South Dakota, Montana, and, of course, Nebraska.

Finally, the last step on the road to statehood was begun 100 years ago this year. By an act of Congress in 1864 and signed by President Lincoln, the citizens of the Territory were authorized to draw up a constitution for presentation to Congress. Thus, Mr. President, 1964, is a memorable year in that it was this year 100 years ago that the preparatory step was taken with the view toward statehood for Nebraska. Also, in the year of 1864, Nebraska was reduced almost to its present size. The long process culminating in statehood was completed on March 1, 1867, when President Johnson by proclamation recognized the free State of Nebraska as the 37th State in the Union.

Nebraskans in the years since statehood have experienced both prosperity and depression, fought against grasshoppers and the elements of nature, and lived always with faith in the future and belief in the strength of the individual. Today Nebraskans in all sections of the United States are making contributions in their own ways to the fulfillment of the American dream of a century ago.

One writer put it this way:

Nebraska has staggered and suffered through three depressions, born of speculation and grasshoppers in the 1870's, agricultural failure and drought in the 1890's, and the total economic collapse of the 1930's.

But Nebraska survived.

When the soil dried up and blew away, the people held fast. When the dollar withered into near worthlessness, it was the value of the people which saved the State. And so it has always been.

Those first white men who settled in Nebraska lived with hardship as an unwelcome, but constant companion. They forged a living on sheer force of daring and guts.

For Nebraska had long been branded as a forgotten desert wasteland where the savage lived, a land unsuitable for agriculture, even for life. It was a place where nature dared man, where the farmer had to gamble to survive.

Pioneer life was a drudgery. Man stood alone out here against the ravages of nature and storm, against the haunting specter of starvation and disease.

The Nebraska of the 20th century which bounced back from the devastating depression of three decades past had no patent on will or courage. Their ancestors had long since showed the way.

Strength of the individual is a heritage in this State, an attribute which was actually the result of necessity. For in the vast, unsettled soil of Nebraska, those who worked the land lived a lonely life, an isolated existence in an environment where self-help was often the only help.

Mr. President, the Nebraska State Centennial Commission is now making plans and arrangements to celebrate the

centennial year of Nebraska statehood. A period from March 1, 1967, through Thanksgiving Day has been set aside for events at the municipal, county, and State levels to commemorate a century of pioneer heritage. This will truly be a grassroots movement by the citizens of Nebraska to show their pride in being Nebraskans and their love for their State.

I take this opportunity to invite my colleagues and the citizens of their States to visit Nebraska in the years ahead and to make special note of the dates set aside for the Nebraska Centennial celebrations, March 1 through Thanksgiving Day, 1967.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

Miss Margaret Joy Tibbets, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

Winthrop G. Brown, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William N. Goodwin, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Brockman Adams, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

George J. Ward, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Thomas M. Dugan, resigned.

COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The following officers of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of captain:

Paul F. Foye
Raymond J. Perry
Ephraim P. Rivard

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety

Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1967. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5085.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. John Sylvester, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Andrew McB. Jackson, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Frank Brandstatter, O351996, Military Police Corps.

Col. Robert Frank Cocklin, O1165715, Artillery.

Col. Harry Jack Mier, Jr., O537865, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Aye Ballard, O342774.

Brig. Gen. Harold Raymond Bauer, O298149.

Brig. Gen. William Reuther Douglas, O373402.

Brig. Gen. Donald Charles Grant, O360644.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Glen Elder, O1014892, Armor.

Col. Hugh Barbee Mott, O1056820, Armor.

Col. Donald Paul Radde, O348479, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Charles Doyle, O1307380, Infantry.

Col. Heber Lowe Minton, O1010514, Infantry.

Col. Robert Outsen, O258366, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Norman James Walton, O391347, Artillery.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James L. Shaw
Daniel J. Massey

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Franklin C. Bacon

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Raymond R. Hall, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ernest J. Notar
Robert F. Walker

Ronnie G. Carter (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named graduates from (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David F. Bolka William F. Schwarz
Carl L. Ludwig Kenneth F. Scigullin-
James R. Proctor sky
Robert D. Rantschler Stephen J. Seyl

Douglas H. Trager (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (officer candidate) to be permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert M. Simpson

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William J. Deely Joseph A. Hunter
Thomas V. DiSilvio Richard Shapiro
Stanley E. Donahoe William A. Stone
Norman A. Goldstein Charles J. Vacanti, Jr.

William A. Kornblum (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman Cardoso
Joseph F. Nataro

Walter E. Beasley III (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David A. Andrzejewski Joseph F. Koenigs
Leonard P. Chandler, Daniel R. Riley
Jr. David A. Sampe
Richard D. Gowin Carl J. Smith

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior

grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jimmy E. Albright Michael D. Callihan

John M. Box Joel O. Diven

Elpidio S. Rallis (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lance J. Bibin Lynden R. Steele
Timothy V. Moore Richard W. Vaughn

The following-named (meritorious non-commissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Leonard L. Ingram.

IN THE NAVY

Lieutenant (junior grade) Joseph F. Jagard, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named lieutenants in the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, George C. Guthrie, William C.
Austin, Ellis E. Moore, James A.
Carter, Charles S. Riley, Joseph F.
Glover, Fred "B"

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Baker, Encell T. Hudson, Gerald W.
Barbarick, Lewis V. Jr. Jermier, Jack R.
Bateman, William L. Johnson, Charles G.
Blanchard, Ernest J. McKinney, Byron C.
Buchanan, Oscar M. Parker, Robert L.
Collins, Paul N. Prestwood, Robert M., Jr.
Cook, William E., Jr. Reeder, James L.
Creed, Euly C., Jr. Roy, Clyde R.
Hardison, Jeffrey J. Tibbs, Robert W.
Hirte, Richard E. Watson, Roy D.
Huddleston, Louis H.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adkins, Wilbur L. Leone, Theresa
Childers, Virgil R. Lyon, Jennings L.
Conway, Lonnie E. Meeler, William F., Jr.
Coslett, Audrey G. Rutkofske, John A.
Cox, Harold E., Jr. Scalise, Raymond A.
Davis, George R. Schroeder, Philip W.
Dederling, Kenneth C. Sharpe, Virgil G.
Doherty, Richard A. Shipman, Dan B., Jr.
Droddy, Donald F. Slaughter, Arthur R.
Foust, Frank R. Sloan, Wallace V.
Holland, Muscoe C., Spain, John H.
Jr. Tancredi, Domenic N.
Jablonske, Donald K. Tarver, Carroll L.
Jacobs, Donald F. Uhlhorn, Elmer C.
Jeffra, Arthur J. Waller, George E.
Jones, John C. Werts, Glenn E.
Konopa, Frank J. White, James A.
Lang, Earl W. White, Theodore L.
Legrande, Frederick Whyte, George L.
O. Wooten, Robert W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Auch, James, M., Jr. Beck, William R.
Barnes, Edward T. Borders, Jack B.
Barr, John G. Bowman, Jack B., Jr.

Burns, William F., Jr.
Castano, John B.
Chapman, John B.
Collins, William J.
Croft, Stuart L.
Davenport, Cedric M.
Drylie, James T., II
Durkin, James J.
Farkas, Louis J., Jr.
Fowler, Eugene C.
Fuscaldo, Robert P.
Giersch, George J.
Hansen, Emery D.
Healy, Kevin M.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Bremner, Bruce B.
Castellano, William J.
Catchings, Thomas J.
Chappel, James R.
Chappell, George C.
Doll, Robert J.
Driscoll, Joseph A.
Dryden, Victor D.
Fisher, George G.
Fox, William E.
Gerhardt, Robert T.
Giersch, Albert E.
Gudmunson, Charles E.
Hawk, Richard S.
Holmes, Ephraim P., Jr.
Kunz, James C.
Lair, James A.
Lash, Franklin B.

SUPPLY CORPS

Chalupsky, Raymond
Chism, David M.
MacGregor, Bruce
Payne, Billy I.
Priest, William G., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Brown, Gerald L.
Russell, William H.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Dasler, Adolph R.
MacConnell, Thomas W.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

To be commanders, line

Lowell D. Chansler
William M. Harrison
Robert Wrzeninski

To be commanders, Medical Corps

Jaime M. Benavides, Jr.
Elgin C. Cowart

To be commanders, Chaplain Corps

Ralph W. Below
Benjamin J. Davis
Robert L. Deal

To be commanders, Dental Corps

Robert W. Bruce
Theodore E. Carlson
Joseph R. Evans

To be lieutenant commanders, line

Abbott, William B., III
Ackerman, Richard F.
Adair, Frederick S.
Adams, George J., Jr.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Akagi, Joe L.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
Alexander, Marvin G.

Hudspeth, John R.
Kavanaugh, James A.
King, Wesley A.
Ligon, Elvin S., III
Ouzts, "H" "C"
Peacock, Billy F.
Poe, William H.
Rickgauer, Donald R.
Seely, Peter R.
Staton, Billy E.
Steele, Richard H.
Tollefsen, Thomas S.
Whalen, John M.

Amor, Raymond C.
Anastion, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Alden B.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, Duane E.
Anderson, Paul L.
Anderson, Robert J.
Andes, Paul G.
Andrews, Leon L.
Angler, Donald L.
Anthony, David J.
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Argiro, Vincent J.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Edward M.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, John E.
Ashley, William H.
Ashman, Lee E.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Atherton, Robert F.
Avalone, Eugene M.
Avery, Howell D.
Axthelm, Charles E.
Aylward, William J., Jr.
Ayres, James H.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Backes, Ronald J.
Backman, Fred M.
Bacon, James A.
Bacon, John L.
Bademan, Harold W.
Badgett, John J.
Bahn, John J.
Bailey, George T.
Bailey, Kenneth R., Jr.
Baillie, Richard H.
Baker, James E., Jr.
Baker, James G.
Balchunas, Robert C.
Baldrige, Louis D., Jr.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ball, Millard C.
Ballew, Richard F., Jr.
Bandurraga, Thomas, Jr.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, Bruce R.
Banks, William E., IV
Bariteau, Frederick J.
Barker, Merle M.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, John B.
Barnes, William M.
Barnett, Gerald P.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Gardner S.
Barrett, Roy F.
Barringer, Malcolm L.
Barron, William T.
Barrow, Robert W.
Bartholomew, John L.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Bates, John A., Jr.
Bath, Alan H.
Bathurst, Robert B.
Batten, Charles G.
Beard, Donald W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beaulieu, Reo A.
Beavers, Roy L., Jr.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stuart M.
Beech, Wayne "L"
Beecher, John D.

Beem, Jack M.
Belcher, Sylvester A.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gerald R.
Bender, Leslie C., Jr.
Benero, Manuel A., Jr.
Bennett, James L.
Benton, Hugh A.
Berg, Richard C.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berkley, Lawrence N.
Berndt, Donald J.
Berry, George H., Jr.
Berry, Joel H., Jr.
Bethke, Earl E., Jr.
Bibby, Lowe H., III
Bills, Robert G.
Bingham, Thomas, Jr.
Bird, Charles S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bixby, Harry L., Jr.
Blackadar, Paul F.
Blackington, Richard N.
Blackwood, Jack D.
Blades, Lawrence T.
Blair, Closkey L., Jr.
Blake, Harry R., Jr.
Blanding, Robert L.
Blass, Richard H.
Bohannon, William L.
Boles, Lee R.
Boles, Richard L.
Bolst, Albert L.
Boone, Robert R.
Booth, Roger G.
Bos, Roger C.
Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
Botsko, Ronald T.
Bouknight, Foy H.
Bouvette, Albert J.
Bowen, Albert S., III
Bowen, William S.
Bowers, Henry H.
Bowman, Lawrence F.
Bozeman, Henry G.
Brackett, Gerald F.
Bradford, Gerald R.
Bradshaw, Brice L.
Brady, Allen C.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Brandel, William J., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bress, Allyn V.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridge, Daniel T.
Bridge, James A., Jr.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
Bridgman, Russell B.
Bristol, Robert B.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, Walter A.
Brown, Bobby J.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, George W. M.
Brown, George A.
Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Brownley, John H.
Bruner, James R.
Bruning, Richard A.
Bryant, William R.
Bryla, Dominic A.
Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.
Buck, Donald D.
Buck, John A.
Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
Bucklin, Jerald W.
Bunyan, Lawrence P.
Burdon, Eugene R.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burkemper, Raymond G.

Burkhart, Paul C.
Burley, John R.
Burnett, James A.
Burnett, John H.
Burriss, John R.
Burrows, Herbert J.
Bush, James T.
Bush, Robert H.
Butler, Archie P., Jr.
Butler, Charles A.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., III
Byrd, Paul R.
Cagney, Thomas P.
Cahill, William A., Jr.
Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Califf, Toxey H.
Calkins, Donald L.
Callahan, Earle R.
Callan, John F.
Cameron, Kenneth R.
Cameron, Norman A.
Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, John A.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, Ronald A.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Cann, Tedford J.
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Carden, Marshall B., Jr.
Carey, William R.
Carl, William T.
Carlin, Robert J.
Carlisle, David R.
Carlson, Howard L.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ernest H.
Carson, Ralph
Carter, Tandy W.
Case, George P., Jr.
Case, Richard W.
Caskey, Donald L.
Cassani, Henry L.
Cassidy, Joseph B., Jr.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Caudill, William E.
Cauffman, Charles E.
Caulk, Robert F.
Cave, John G.
Cave, Thomas H.
Cecil, Durward C.
Chadwick, John R.
Chambers, Lawrence C.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Charbonneau, George L.
Chasse, Robert L.
Cheatham, Augustus B.
Chereskin, Howard
Cherrier, Herbert A.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesebrough, Richard
Chesky, James A.
Chesser, Samuel L.
Chewning, Robert W.
Childers, Donald J.
Chinn, Clarence E.
Chisum, Oscar C.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christie, Francis J.
Christon, Paul W.
Clare, James S.
Clark, Donald E.
Clark, Robert T.
Clark, Stanley D.
Clarke, Robert R.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clermont, William J., Jr.
Clew, William M.
Cloughley, William D.
Coale, William A.
Cochrane, James H.
Cockell, William A., Jr.
Coffman, Charles L.

Colner, John A.
Collier, John H.
Colligan, Thomas R.
Collins, Frank C., Jr.
Collins, Harold E.
Combs, Martin F.
Combs, Robert E.
Condon, Edward J., Jr.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
Connally, Robert F., III
Connell, Lewis E.
Connolly, Robert B.
Connors, Eugene T.
Conrad, Peter C.
Cooke, Robert A.
Cooney, David M.
Cooper, Donald H.
Corbett, William J., III
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, James W.
Corsepius, Everett D.
Coski, Bernard J.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotten, Thomas R., Jr.
Cotugno, Paul J.
Councell, Thomas S.
Crain, James D.
Craven, Robert C. E.
Cretsinger, Wilbur B.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Cronin, Francis W.
Cross, Douglas E.
Cross, William F.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Cruden, David S.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Alan R.
Curran, Robert W.
Currie, Edgar I.
Cush, Casimo J.
Cywin, Lawrence
Dallaure, Richard P.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
Dal Plan, Joseph H.
Dalton, Charles W.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Dapogny, Robert J.
DaRozza, Aldo J.
Darrell, Charles G.
Darwin, William C.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davis, Frank E.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Davis, Paul H., Jr.
Davis, William B.
Davison, David D.
Day, Arthur R.
Deaton, Paul
Degnan, Francis J.
De Mun, Taylor K.
Denbigh, Robert S., Jr.
Denton, David N.
Derby, George K.
Derr, John P.
Desjardin, John W.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
DeView, Joseph R.
De Wispelaere, Earl L.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dietz, Richard C.
Dimmick, David K.
Dion, Laurent N.
Dobyns, John E.
Dodd, Charles A.
Doelling, Robert D.
Doggett, William K.
Dorn, Gerald W.

- Dorney, William J.
D'Orso, James N.
Downe, Herbert B., Jr.
Doyle, William J.
Drews, Sheldon
Driskell, Omer L.
Duckett, Philip Van H. L.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
DuMont, Sidney P., Jr.
Duncan, Dale W.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Dyer, George T., Jr.
Dykens, Thomas M., Jr.
Eakle, Burke E.
Earl, William C.
Eastman, Alfred C., III
Ebbert, Edwin L.
Echols, Kenneth W.
Ecklund, Hugo L., Jr.
Eddy, William P., III
Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edmunds, Philip H.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, Chester C.
Edwards, Forrest L.
Eggert, Lowell F.
Ekman, Roger E.
Elder, James C.
Eller, Richard L.
Elliott, Charles L.
Elliott, Jack "B"
Ellis, George D., Jr.
Ellison, John C.
Emerson, Jesse R., III
Engel, Richard E.
Englehart, Harry J.
Engquist, Gordon W.
Enos, Ralph L.
Erkelens, Clarence
Eshman, John R.
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, David W.
Evans, Laverne E.
Ewy, Howard W.
Faessel, Matthew W.
Fakoury, Ernest P.
Farley, James W.
Farrell, Joseph A., III
Farren, Merritt C.
Farris, George K.
Fay, Edward S.
Federico, Charles D.
Feely, Robert J.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Ferguson, Andrew C.
Fernandes, James E.
Fink, Edward R.
Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
Finneran, William J.
Finney, Jack L.
Fisher, Paul J.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitts, Jean M.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fleeman, Frederick M.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Fletcher, Richard M.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Fonville, Henry P.
Ford, James M., Jr.
Ford, Leon E., Jr.
Forrester, James E.
Foster, John F.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, John W.
Fox, Raymond G., Jr.
Foy, Edward W.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Franklin, Billy D.
Fremd, Harry L.
French, William L.
Friend, Joseph F.
Friese, George A.
Frost, John F., III
Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
Gahafer, Joseph G.
Gair, Bruce O.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gamber, Harold W.
Garcia, Jaime
Gardner, Howard W.
Gardner, John E., Jr.
Garland, Daniel H.
Garner, Charles H.
Garrett, Charles I., Jr.
Gaskin, Richard G.
Gatewood, Tommy L.
Gatje, George C.
Gauthier, John O.
Gearhart, Norman R.
Gehres, Francis C.
Gibbins, Gareth W.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Gillan, Martin J., III
Gillcrst, Paul T.
Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
Gleason, Richard E.
Gnadt, Fredric
Goetschius, Forrest D.
Golde, Morton
Goldstein, Jonas L.
Goodfellow, John
Goodwin, Bruce G.
Gordon, David E.
Graffam, Earl H.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Richard T.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grappi, Robert L.
Gray, Harvey, Jr.
Gray, James H.
Gray, Walter S., III
Green, William C.
Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
Griffin, Jack E.
Groder, Robert E.
Groehn, Gerhard C.
Grosshuesch, David K.
Gulsinger, Lawrence B., Jr.
Gumser, Dale L.
Gunn, William J.
Gurney, Charles E., III
Haack, Donald E.
Hackett, Robert A.
Hagensik, William H.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Haigh, Alfred D., Jr.
Haight, Gardiner M.
Hale, William T.
Hall, Harrell W.
Hall, Thomas D.
Hallen, Byron W.
Halton, Joseph H.
Hamilton, John W.
Hamilton, Leroy A.
Hamrick, Thomas D.
Handford, Richard C.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hansell, Emerson L., Jr.
Hansen, Merle C.
Hansen, Norman T.
Hansen, Ronald E.
Hantz, Francis A.
Harbick, Donald L.
Hardesty, John F.
Hardisty, Huntington
Harnden, Charles G.
Harp, Robert M.
Harper, Roger W.
Harris, Jack R.
Harris, James W.
Harrison, James H., Jr.
Harsb, Loinel R.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Richard L.
Hartley, John D.
Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
Hatcher, George M.
Havel, Edward F.
Hawkins, Phil "R"
Hawkins, Richard M.
Hayes, Morris L.
Head, John L.
Head, William N.
Headley, Allen B.
Healy, Richard H.
Heasley, Waldo L.
Heath, Frederick T.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Hedges, Ralph R.
Heenan, Richard D.
Heffernan, George A.
Helgeson, Warren A.
Holland, Gerald H.
Helme, Charles R.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Hennessy, William J.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herring, Edwin L.
Hess, Adolph W., Jr.
Hession, James M.
Hetu, Herbert E.
Hickman, William J.
Hicks, Harold F., Jr.
Hicks, John W.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.
Higgins, Raymond F.
Highleyman, Searle F.
Hilder, Frederick A.
Hill, Lucio W.
Hinkley, Harold L.
Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
Hipple, William J.
Hoffman, Merle L.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., II
Holine, Lelf A.
Hollandsworth, Roy M.
Hollick, Frederick B.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holmberg, Lennart G.
Holt, Neil G.
Holway, Nathan C.
Hopper, Richard S.
Horne, Charles F., III
Hossfeld, James F.
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
Howey, Robert E.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
Hull, George T.
Hume, Robert J.
Hunt, Albert M.
Hunter, Herbert P.
Hurlbut, Francis D., Jr.
Hyde, Robert A.
Isemann, Frederick J., Jr.
Ingle, Edmund W.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Bobby R.
Inman, Wayne D.
Irby, Charles R.
Irlandi, Santo A.
Irrgang, Carl H.
Jaburg, Conrad, J.
Jackson, Demster M.
Jackson, Thomas L.
Jacob, Robert E.
James, Charlie N., Jr.
Jameson, Henry C., Jr.
Janulis, George
Jarvis, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Jayne, Gordon H.
Jeter, Norman L.
Jewell, Thomas A.
Johansen, Wayne A.
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Clifford D.
Johnson, Dale W.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Emil L.
Johnson, Frederick C.
Johnson, George M.
Johnson, Guy D.
Johnson, Oren D.
Johnson, Philip E.
Johnson, Robert G.
Johnston, George T.
Johnston, Maurice M., Jr.
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, John E.
Jones, Richard H.
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Josephson, Henning C.
Jubb, Donald E.
Kaczmarek, Carl C.
Kalakowski, Joseph E.
Kalmus, William B.
Karvala, Curtis A.
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keane, James P.
Kearns, James T.
Keathley, Charles C.
Kebschull, Herbert W.
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keeney, David J.
Kehoe, James W., Jr.
Kehoe, Thomas R.
Kelley, Byron C.
Kelley, Frank A., III
Kelley, Frederick W.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelsey, Robert L.
Kelt, William N.
Kemble, John R.
Kemble, Richard E.
Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, Walter J.
Kennedy, William B.
Kershaw, Daniel J.
Kidd, William S.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Kilmer, Donald A.
Kim, Alfred H. S., Jr.
Kimzey, Walter F.
King, Everett D.
Kinnbrew, Thomas R.
Kirby, Albert D.
Kirk, Robert L.
Kirschke, Ernest J.
Kling, William T.
Kniely, Joseph L.
Knight, Charles H.
Knopp, William A.
Knutson, Donald W.
Knutson, Wilbert D.
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Koehne, Richard J.
Kollmann, Glenn E.
Kosmela, Walter T.
Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Frederick W.
Kraft, Leroy M.
Kuder, Dalton L.
Kuehner, Karl E.
Kugler, Kenneth D.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kully, Sheldon D.
Kuncas, John W.
Kunze, Martin W.
Kvello, Alan
Lacy, Joe R.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, David C.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Lamb, Marion G.
Lamm, William A.
Lancaster, Robert W.
Lane, Archie G.
Langford, John M.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Larkins, Burton J.
Larocque, George N.
Larsen, Richard L.
Larson, Charles D.
Lasowski, Donald T.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavin, Charles V.
Layman, Lawrence
Leahy, John P.
LeBlanc, Georges E., Jr.
Leftwich, James M.
Lenox, Glenn W.
Leonard, Robert W.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leverone, Robert M.
Lewis, Charles G.
Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
Lewis, James T.
Lidel, Carl J.
Lighter, Elbert D.
Liston, John M.
Loberger, James C.
Locke, Walter M.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lockwood, Forrest P.
Lodge, Billups E.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Loggan, Wilfred J.
Logner, Robert L.
Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Lorden, Lawrence R.
Louchheim, William S., Jr.
Lounsbury, Jack A.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lovvorn, John D.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Luckett, Thomas W.
Ludwick, Louis L.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lumsden, Richard E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
Lykes, William F. G.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
Macaulay, Angus
MacDonald, William P.
Macfie, Richard B.
MacKercher, John C.
MacPherson, John J.
Madden, Raymond A.
Madigan, James A.
Maggay, Isidoro, Jr.
Mains, Homer O., Jr.
Malaney, Robert E.
Malone, Roy W.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Maloney, Peter M.
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Mandeville, Theodore S., Jr.
Manduca, Theodore W.
Manfredi, John P.
Mann, Robert E.
Manring, Charles D.
Marbott, Henry W.
Marin, William T.
Marsh, Lee S.
Marshall, Robert M.
Marshall, Samuel R.
Martin, Donald E.
Martin, Tyrone G.
Martin, William R.
Masse, Donald M.
Massimi, Robert F.
Matherson, Richard
Mathis, Thomas R.
Mattioni, Blasco
Mattson, Donald J.
Mau, George W., Jr.
Maveety, Patrick J.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
McAuliffe, John H.
McBain, Robert F.
McBurney, William J.
McCafferty, William E.
McCardell, James E., Jr.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCarty, Richard W.
McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.
McCormick, Daniel G., III
McCoy, Robert B.
McCoy, Roy E.
McCune, Joe D.
McCutcheon, Edwin L.
McDaniel, Clarence L.
McDonald, Clyde D.
McDonald, Robert P.
McDowell, Russell N.
McFadden, Albert J., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGaughy, Richard W.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGrath, Harold A.
McGuire, Orville W.
McHugh, James J.
McIntyre, John J.
McKee, Robert X.
McLaird, Preston, Jr.
McLaughlin, Dean N.
McLeod, Kenneth M.
McMillan, Donald G.
McMillan, Louis K., Jr.
McNeely, James S.
McNett, William T.
McPadden, Donald F. X.
McWey, Russell B.
McWilliam, John R.
Meacham, James A.
Mead, Theodore E.
Meador, Bruce I.
Meadows, Okey I.
Meek, Kenneth L.
Meeks, Thomas L.
Mehl, James P.
Meltzer, Melvin
Merrill, Forest "J"
Messer, Charles L.
Messer, Jarvis N.
Messina, Sylvester C.
Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
Miale, Robert E.
Michaels, Robert J.
Millus, Paul L.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, James L.
Miller, John R.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Richard J.
Miller, Robert L.
Miner, Duane A.
Miner, Jack B.
Mircheff, Robert A.
Mischke, Gayland J.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, Grant L.
Mitchell, John R. C.
Mitchell, Leland G.
Moffitt, Russell L.
Monroe, Charles H., Jr.
Montgomery, Stephen C.
Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Charles J.
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Robert S.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moore, Tommy C.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.

- Moriarty, Peter M.
 Morris, Henry C., Jr.
 Morris, Howard L.
 Morris, Robert E.
 Morris, Robert E.
 Morrison, Daniel N.
 Morrison, Royden U.
 Morrow, Charles D.
 Morse, Harold C.
 Morse, Jack L.
 Mounce, Claude E.
 Mountford, Edward J.
 Mueller, George E.
 Mullane, Thomas F.
 Mullin, James
 Mulloy, Paul J.
 Muncey, William E.
 Murphy, Douglas C.
 Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
 Murphy, Timothy J.
 Murphy, Ray D.
 Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
 Myers, Carroll E.
 Myers, William S.
 Mylander, Stig J.
 Nation, William C.
 Naugle, James O.
 Naylor, Charles K.
 Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
 Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
 Nelson, Frank C., Jr.
 Nelson, Jack H.
 Nelson, James M.
 Nelson, Leroy C.
 Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
 Nevius, William B.
 Newsome, James W.
 Newton, Robert B.
 Nichols, John F.
 Niedbala, Thomas F.
 Nielsen, George L.
 Nolan, Joseph D.
 Nordtvedt, Ernest R.
 Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
 North, Dean B.
 Norton, Earl W.
 Norton, Richard J.
 Noyes, Bradford W.
 Numbers, Earl W.
 Nunneley, James K.
 O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.
 O'Brien, Jerome L.
 O'Bryan, Michael E.
 O'Connell, James M.
 O'Connell, John F.
 O'Connor, John E.
 Oder, Howard W.
 Odman, William A.
 O'Donnell, John H., Jr.
 O'Donnell, John W.
 O'Gara, Patrick E.
 Ogden, Howard "A", Jr.
 Ogle, William J.
 Olan, Harry
 Oldham, Albert W.
 O'Leary, William E.
 Olson, James W.
 Olson, Richard S.
 Olson, Thane N.
 Olson, Willard R.
 O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
 Organ, James W.
 Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
 Ortega, Joseph J.
 Orvis, Peter H.
 Orzalli, John B.
 Oster, John S.
 Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
 Overdorf, Thomas R.
 Pacl, Lawrence J.
 Palatini, Glenn L.
 Palmer, Wallace C.
 Panarese, Adam F.
 Pankratz, Carl J.
 Pappas, George T.
 Parkhurst, David C.
 Parks, William W.
 Parrish, Donald E.
 Patch, Irwin, Jr.
 Pattee, Arthur W.
 Pattee, Richard S.
 Patten, Michael A.
 Paul, John E.
 Paul, Raymond E.
 Paul, Robert F.
 Pauly, Donald E.
 Payne, Douglas W.
 Pearce, Earl H.
 Pearson, John F., Jr.
 Peelle, Morris A.
 Pendell, Carl R.
 Penney, William R.
 Pennypacker, William S.
 Pentony, John F.
 Perrault, Mark E.
 Perry, Billy
 Perry, Franklin H.
 Perry, Timothy J.
 Peters, Paul F.
 Peters, Robert E.
 Petherick, George L.
 Phillips, Robert A.
 Phillips, William R.
 Pierce, Ray E.
 Pierce, William H., Jr.
 Pilon, Jerome R.
 Ping, Vernon "S", Jr.
 Pinkerton, Roy "T"
 Piper, Harold L.
 Pirrone, Anthony P.
 Placchi, Howard S.
 Platt, Grafton S.
 Plow, Arthur E.
 Pogue, David W.
 Pohl, Richard R.
 Polatty, Donald B.
 Polling, William E.
 Pollak, Charles D.
 Pollak, Morris
 Pope, Daniel K., IV
 Post, Robert E., Jr.
 Pototsky, William J.
 Poulos, Michael C., Jr.
 Powell, George "W"
 Powell, John J.
 Powell, William V.
 Powers, Trent R.
 Preble, Russell A., Jr.
 Preston, Edgar H.
 Prezioso, Ronald
 Prisby, Donald E.
 Prosser, Walter R.
 Pugh, Jack M.
 Quartararo, Michael A.
 Quick, Jay E.
 Quin, Clayton W.
 Quinn, Robert T.
 Quintmeyer, Herman C.
 Rabun, Floyd K.
 Rafalowski, Joseph W., Jr.
 Rainville, Duane D.
 Ramsey, David G.
 Ramsey, William E.
 Randall, Thomas R.
 Randolph, Joseph L.
 Rankin, George M., Jr.
 Rapkin, Jerome
 Rasmussen, Robert L.
 Ray, Glen P.
 Raynes, Robert R.
 Rea, Maurice V.
 Reaves, Joseph C.
 Redfield, John M.
 Redifer, Andrew P., III
 Reed, Richard W.
 Reed, Robert G.
 Reed, William H.
 Reeder, Ralph J.
 Reeks, Richard W.
 Reep, Harlan E.
 Renicky, Donald D.
 Renz, Donald J.
 Reynolds, Roy S.
 Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
 Rhodes, Francis E., Jr.
 Rhodes, John P.
 Ricardo, Benny J.
 Rice, James O.
 Rice, Stanley G.
 Rich, Richard
 Richard, Jackson B.
 Richards, William C.
 Richards, William D.
 Richardson, Richard H.
 Ricks, Robert R.
 Ries, Allen L.
 Rigsbee, Clifford M.
 Riley, Tad T.
 Rilling, Alexander W.
 Riordan, Edward J.
 Ritchey, Donald D.
 Rivers, Wendell B.
 Roane, Donald P.
 Robbins, Allan W.
 Robertson, James L.
 Roberts, Charles T.
 Roberts, John A.
 Roberts, William E.
 Robertson, Douglas B.
 Robinson, Donald W.
 Robinson, Kirby L.
 Roby, Grady H.
 Rochford, John M.
 Rockett, John S.
 Rockwell, Nevin L.
 Rodda, John D.
 Rodgers, Frederick A.
 Rodgers, Harvey P.
 Rogers, Richard J.
 Rollins, James "J"
 Ross, William A., III
 Rossie, John W. F.
 Rowden, William H.
 Rowland, James C.
 Ruecker, Kenneth H.
 Rueff, Eugene C.
 Rumplick, Rudolph H.
 Rush, Thornwell F.
 Rushing, Charles F.
 Sacks, Harold H.
 Sagerholm, James A.
 Salomon, Ferdinand L.
 Sanford, Stephen J.
 Sapp, John, Jr.
 Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
 Saul, Elmer L.
 Saunders, Thomas J.
 Saunders, William H., III
 Sayer, William D.
 Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
 Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.
 Scarafone, Ronald
 Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
 Schaefer, Oscar
 Scheidler, Willard E.
 Schimansky, John A.
 Schluter, Hugo E.
 Schonenberg, Hans P.
 Schroder, Austin R.
 Schroeder, Robert E.
 Schuller, Gordon J.
 Schultz, Ford J. E.
 Schultz, John L., Jr.
 Schulze, Robert H.
 Schurr, Thomas P.
 Schutz, Albert C., Jr.
 Scott, Edward T.
 Scott, Frank P.
 Scott, John H., Jr.
 Scull, John D.
 Searfus, William H.
 Sears, Glen R.
 Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
 Seeger, Charles E.
 Self, David L.
 Seljos, Lloyd T.
 Service, James E.
 Seymour, Ernest R.
 Shafer, Lawrence
 Shaffer, George W.
 Shaid, Robert A.
 Shanahan, Thomas L.
 Shanahan, William F.
 Shearer, Peter S.
 Sheehan, William F., Jr.
 Sheely, Donald M.
 Sheets, Roger E.
 Sheldon, Robert E.
 Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
 Shepherd, David C.
 Sherar, Robert C.
 Sherman, John W.
 Sherman, Lee H.
 Shurtleff, Bruce K.
 Sibert, George C.
 Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
 Sigmon, Harold F.
 Sigsworth, David E.
 Simms, James T.
 Simon, Philip C.
 Simons, Donald W.
 Simpson, Philip M.
 Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
 Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
 Sinclair, Alexander M.
 Siska, Edward
 Sisson, Donald E.
 Skube, Edward A.
 Skyrud, Jerome P.
 Small, Joseph F.
 Smedalige, Robert L.
 Smedberg, William R., IV
 Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
 Smith, Carol C., Jr.
 Smith, Clifford R.
 Smith, Gilbert E.
 Smith, Hugh T.
 Smith, James R.
 Smith, John V.
 Smith, John P.
 Smith, Kenneth G.
 Smith, Ordell
 Smith, Paul D.
 Smith, Paul J., Jr.
 Smith, Richard C.
 Smith, Scott L.
 Smith St. Clair
 Smith, William M., Jr.
 Snyder, Fred D.
 Snyder, Herbert J. V.
 Snyder, James M.
 Snyder, Ned "C."
 Solter, Carl F.
 Sothan, Norman L.
 Sowinski, Stanislaus J.
 Span, William F.
 Spear, Richard T.
 Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
 Sperling, David J.
 Springer, Howard C.
 Sprunk, William, Jr.
 Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
 Squires, Walter G., Jr.
 Stadelhofer, Robert R.
 Stader, John F.
 Stafford, Richard M.
 Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
 Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
 Stangl, Richard J.
 Stanley, Edward E.
 Stanley, Joseph K.
 Staple, David F.
 Stark, Peter A., Jr.
 Starkey, Nelson R., Jr.
 Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
 Steckbeck, Francis J.
 Stein, George D., Jr.
 Stein, Norman F.
 Stevens, Ralph H.
 Stewart, Gene R.
 Stewart, Rodney L.
 Still, Donald A.
 Stillier, Bertram H.
 Stine, Leon L., Jr.
 Stinner, Robert J.
 Stocking, William B.
 Stockmeir, Dean
 Stoeck, Leonard A.
 Stolle, Edward S., Jr.
 Stone, James M.
 Story, Warren L.
 Stout, Edward N.
 Stovall, Walter W.
 Straney, Charles N.
 Streightiff, Charles W.
 Strockbine, Richard E.
 Strohm, James J.
 Strunk, Arthur A.
 Stump, John M.
 Sudduth, Roger M.
 Sugg, Ross E.
 Sullivan, Alfred B.
 Sullivan, Edward T.
 Sullivan, Francis L.
 Sullivan, James J.
 Sullivan, Robert H.
 Sullivan, Walter F.
 Summerfield, Edward R.
 Summers, Howard P.
 Sutherland, Benjamin T. W.
 Sutton, John F.
 Swank, Donald E.
 Swartrauber, Sayre A.
 Sweet, William J.
 Sylvester, Gerald D.
 Talkin, Philip S.
 Tallet, Arthur J.
 Tallman, Elmer C.
 Tate, Charles G.
 Taylor, Clinton W.
 Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
 Taylor, James D., Jr.
 Taylor, Jesse, Jr.
 Tetreault, Paul J.
 Thamm, Tom B.
 Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
 Thomas, David H.
 Thomas, Douglas N.
 Thomas, Kenneth G.
 Thomas, Richard T.
 Thomas, Robert J.
 Thomas, Robert F.
 Thompson, Archibald S.
 Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
 Thompson, Clifford E.
 Thompson, William S.
 Till, Ernest A.
 Tillerson, Leonard E.
 Tobias, Ralph W.
 Tompkins, George E.
 Tonseth, Thomas H., III
 Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
 Treiber, Arthur E.
 Trens, Mike J.
 Trimble, Richard W.
 Troffer, George J., Jr.
 Trost, Carlisle A. H.
 Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
 Tucker, Alvin E.
 Turk, Herman L.
 Turnage, Robert L.
 Tuszyński, Raymond S.
 Tuzo, Lamar W.
 Tuzo, Paul B., III
 Tyson, Billie C.
 Uehlinger, John C.
 Uhrig, William R.
 Upton, Don L.
 Usilton, William B.
 Vahsen, George M.
 Valade, Larry G.
 Van Arsdol, Robert A.
 VanBuskirk, George F.
 Van Hook, Gordon
 Van Houten, Laurence P.
 Varley, James F.
 Varney, Jack E.
 Verser, John K.
 Victor, Francis W.
 Vine, Victor J.
 Voegelien, Gordon R.
 VonChristierson, William W.
 VonWantoch, Harvey
 Voorhees, John E.
 Vrieze, Edwin H., III
 Wadsworth, Francis L.
 Waggoner, Kenneth K.
 Waite, Charles E.
 Wakeland, Max W.
 Wakeman, Curtiss O.
 Walczak, Norbert F.
 Walden, John W.
 Walker, Samuel B.
 Walker, William B.
 Wall, Joseph E.
 Wallace, Cedric S.
 Wallace, Robert J.
 Walling, Eugene K.
 Wanamaker, John F.
 Wandres, Victor C.
 Ward, Arthur T.
 Ward, Carl B.
 Ward, Conley R.
 Ward, Gene P.
 Ward, John E.
 Ware, Owen H.
 Warren, Tommy H., Jr.
 Waslewski, Alex, Jr.
 Wassell, James W.
 Watson, Thomas W.
 Watts, Charles R., Jr.
 Webber, Gene D.
 Webster, Edward W. V.
 Weedon, Robert E.
 Weeks, George H.
 Weimerskirch, John R.
 Weintraub, Allan P.
 Welch, Bernard W.
 Welch, Clyde R.
 Weller, Thomas G., Jr.
 Wellman, Harold N.
 Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
 Wells, Lawrence H.
 Wenker, William A.
 Wenzel, Robert F.
 Westman, Robert L.
 West, Gordon R.
 Wettroth, John R.
 Wetz, James E.
 Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
 Wheeler, Robert A.
 Wheeler, Robert L.
 Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
 Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
 Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
 Whitaker, Robert McK.
 White, John E.
 White, Maurice G.
 White, Paul G., Jr.
 White, Steven A.
 Whitley, Clyde T.
 Whittaker, Don J.
 Whorton, William R.
 Whyte, Kent E.
 Widder, John A., Jr.
 Wilbert, John F.
 Wilde, Stanford R.
 Wilder, William E.
 Wiley, Kenneth R.
 Wilhelm, Quentin E.
 Wilkins, Howard W.
 Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
 Williams, Charles D.
 Williams, Charles K.
 Williams, Douglas A.
 Williams, John T.
 Williams, James E.
 Williams, James G., III
 Williams, Kenneth A.
 Williams, Ross N.
 Williamson, Paul W.
 Willard, Bobbie D.
 Willis, Francis R.
 Wills, Doynne R., Jr.
 Wilson, Charles E.

Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Edward W.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wilson, Robert R.
Wilson, Samuel B.
Wimberly, Tommy C.
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winkel, Raymond N.
Winkler, Richard C.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
Winter, Harold I.
Winters, Charles A.
Wisdom, Jessie R.
Wiseman, Charles H.
Wiseman, Hobart J.
Withers, Christopher
Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wolff, Kenneth L.
Wolff, William M., Jr.
Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Stephen C.

To be lieutenant commanders, line (LDO)

Donald E. Wallace
Elmer C. Everett
Martin D. Archer
Donald A. Cruse
Frank W. Hughes, Jr.
George T. Chapman, Jr.
Andrew G. Szymanski
Ellis G. Kelly
Gordon F. Averitt
Cecil King
Sylvester F. North
John K. Pegues, Jr.
George Stenke
Everett R. Peugh
James E. Criner
William R. Leibold
John J. Bramblett, Jr.
Arthur A. Bish
William O. Thomson
Robert Pescott
Everett N. Leach
Walter A. Ramsey
Joseph St. Marie
Willard F. Waterfield
Ted K. Tillotson
Bernard H. Garrett
James P. Padgett
Ernest L. Cobern
William G. Sandberg
Jackson M. Tamsky
Joseph E. Pinning
Albert R. Reid
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.
Richard E. Mikkelsen
John D. Lewallen
Lloyd G. Peterson, Jr.
George J. Evans
Robert G. Jacks
Wilbur P. Powers
Frank Dievendoff
Joe J. Lillienfeld
John H. Church
Garlin R. Read
George W. Macualey
Eugene J. McGuire
Lloyd E. Murdock
Robert G. Jackson
Donald A. Christensen
Robert M. Johnson
Searle W. Woods
Randall C. Roush
Alonzo C. Jarrett
Lander H. Turpin
Clement Dersin
Howard A. Gire
Mervin Rowland
Andrew Clark

To be lieutenant commanders, Medical Corps

Ahtye, Perry
Aiken, Robert J.
Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Andersen, Martin G.
Arana, Thomas

Wood, Thomas H.
Woodbury, Robert E.
Woody, William R.
Woodyard, Jon C.
Woolway, James E.
Wright, Richard L.
Wright, Ross W.
Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
Wyatt, William C., III
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yamnicky, John D.
Yeager, George E.
Yearous, Glenn W.
Yetman, William R.
Yocom, Earnest
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, John W.
Youngquist, John A.
Yount, Tim B.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zong, Donald E.
Zvanovec, Ladimir J.

Balas, George I.
Balyeat, George E.
Barcey, Stephen J., Jr.
Barchet, Stephen
Bargatzke, Fred O.
Barnes, Sheldon H.
Barreca, Joseph P., Jr.
Bauer, Paul R.
Beaudry, Arthur A.
Bellamy, James C.
Belser, Robert D.
Best, William C.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Blackburn, Laurence H., Jr.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Bornmann, Robert C.
Borowsky, Melvin
Botimer, Allen R.
Bowman, Ervil R., Jr.
Boyden, Douglas G.
Bramblett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
Bristow, William M.
Brothers, William "S"
Brown, Leo R.
Brown, Robert A.
Brunner, William F.
Burningham, Richard A.
Cahill, Lewis N.
Carver, Michael C.
Cassidy, Walter J., Jr.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Cloyd, David H.
Coates, John R.
Colburn, James E.
Colgrove, Robert C.
Colter, Donald C.
Cooke, James K., Jr.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Cooper, William C., Jr.
Cordier, Robert D.
Cowan, David E.
Crawford, Edward P.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Cross, Gregory H.
Cusack, William E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Davis, Milton D.
Davis, Richard L.
Dean, Philip J.
deArrigotia-Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Debevoise, Neilson T.
Deluca, Hugo S.
Dempsey, William C.
Dewaal, Jan G.
Deyton, John W., Jr.
Dicus, Donald R.
Doneker, Thomas G.
Donnell, Garrett E.
Donoghue, John J.
Doyle, Fred W.
Easterling, James F.
Edson, Mitchell
Ekvall, Leslie D., Jr.
Ellingson, Abel R.
Elliot, William A.
Emich, Charles H.
Escajeda, Richard M.
Fairfax, George T.
Faulkner, Gerald D.
Fisher, Pierre J., Jr.
Forney, William R.
Fosberg, Richard G.
Fraser, Donald J.
Fraser, Hugh E., Jr.
Gaekle, Dudley J.
Garcia, Robert C.
George, Frederick
German, Roy E.
Giard, Henry L.
Gibbons, William P.
Glickchrist, Don K.
Glass, James L., Jr.
Glick, Herbert E.
Glover, Clarence K., Jr.

Grunawalt, Robert E.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Harrison, Lucius A., Jr.
Hart, George B.
Hartman, John R.
Hauzenblass, John W.
Henderson, Clyde D., Jr.
Highly, Francis M., Jr.
Holm, Victor M.
Hoofar, Wilford D.
Hopping, Donald W.
Houston, Harry R.
Hughes, James L.
Hughes, Luman H., Jr.
Huseby, Helmer W. S.
Jacobs, Edmund P.
Johnsen, Richard P.
Johnson, Walter M.
Joly, Eugene M.
Jones, Warren J., Jr.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyu P.
Kibbey, Ianthus I.
King, Glendall L.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Kostohryz, Francis T.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Largent, Gerald P.
Larson, Dale L.
Lawrence, David L.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Lintner, Donald R.
Lobpreis, Ervin L.
Logan, Jerome A.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Lukash, William M.
Lukens, Robert W., Jr.
Mack, Walter J.
Maher, Francis L.
Martin, Philip R., Jr.
Mazzarella, Italo C.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
McNitzky, Adam A.
McRoberts, Jay W.
Meekins, John A.
Mella, Gordon W.
Miale, August, Jr.
Miller, Alan G.
Miller, Thomas F., Jr.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Millington, Richard A.
Mills, Mitchell
Moga, Gregg M., Jr.
Moore, John L.
Mortensen, Norval
Mucha, Stephen J.
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mulligan, William P.
Mullin, Robert L.
Murgalo, Joseph A.
Narva, William M.
Neugebauer, Marion K.
Nickel, Alvin L.
Nickerson, Charles W.
Nieves, Miguel, Jr.
Ninow, Earl H.
Novotny, Charles A.
Nyberg, Lester P.
Palmer, Hayden D., Jr.
Plaut, Martin R.
Pohl, Charles E.
Potter, Jack W.
Powell, Malcolm R.
Pratt, Hugh S., Jr.
Proulx, Ronald A.
Raasch, Frank O., Jr.
Real, Jack D.
Rehme, Arthur L.
Reid, Donald
Reynolds, John R.
Rice, Bruce H.
Richardson, Fred C.
Rinaldi, "J" Jerome
Rivas, Hector M.
Rizza, Robert G.
Robinson, Donald W.

Rogers, Carl W.
Rosa-Garcia, Mario E.
Royal, Orren L.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Ryskamp, James J., Jr.
Sargent, Robert T.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Seeley, Richard J.
Segaul, Arthur I.
Seig, Duane L.
Sell, Kenneth W.
Senn, Francis E., Jr.
Sierchio, Gerald P.
Simpson, Richard B.
Sisler, Maynard L.
Sleadd, Franklin B.
Small, Robert B.
Sorenson, Robert I.
Stahl, Charles J., III
Stebbins, George G., Jr.
Stenger, John R.
Stevens, John J.
Stitcher, Joseph E.
Stormo, Alan C.
Stotka, Victor L.
Sweeny, John P.
TenEyck, David R.
Thomas, Robert C.
Toussaint, Harold E., Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, Supply Corps

Adair, Joseph P.
Ayling, Charles W.
Barrett, Charles W.
Barton, Mortimer F., Jr.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Bolander, Jack "C"
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyle, John J.
Brady, James A.
Brett, Justin D.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Brunson, Robert L.
Buckman, Robert S.
Burns, Richard C.
Calais, Clifford A.
Caliman, Wayman G., Jr.
Carr, Joseph D.
Carson, Donald E.
Catanach, Anthony H.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Cavanaugh, Alfred G.
Chandler, Hugh H.
Chapman, Darrell S.
Connelly, Charles T.
Crane, Barrett
Curtin, Pat
Cuson, Charles E.
Davis, Harold R.
Davison, David D., Jr.
Derby, Francis A.
Desroches, Sylvio J., Jr.
Devine, Paul L.
Devine, Wilfrid
DeWinter, Richard E.
Dickey, William H.
Donnelly, Goodwin, III
Dorsey, Elton E.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Drake, William D.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dukeshier, Raymond V.
Dunlevy, John H.
Durham, Graydon M., Jr.
Eckert, George H., Jr.
Edsall, Van T.
Epstein, Edwin S., III
Fanelty, William C.
Felthousen, Charles E.
Fischer, Robert R.
Fleisher, Oscar T., Jr.
Foster, Robert W.
French, Robert T.
French, Robert C.

Townsend, Guy B.
Trone, James N.
Trumble, Theodore J.
Upton, Richard T.
Van Orden, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Villafana-Justicia, Carlos
Voshell, Thomas H., Jr.
Waldstreichler, Howard E.
Walker, Robert E.
Walker, William W. A.
Wallace, Ralph E., Jr.
Walton, Fred R.
Ware, James G.
Welch, Cecil C.
Wells, Robert M.
Wenger, Norman E.
Wentworth, Alan F.
Wetzel, Richard A.
Whetsell, Joe E.
Whitmore, John T.
Wilhelm, Harry W.
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Wilson, John S.
Wolfe, Franklin M.
Wood, Joseph H., Jr.
Woodstein, Ira J.
Yarley, Dewey H.
Young, James M.

French, Walter H., Jr.
Frost, Shirley D.
Galvez, Richard M.
Ghoshley, Gary D.
Gillespie, James A., Jr.
Giordano, Andrew A.
Goeres, Gerald F.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gordon, John J.
Goslin, Thomas C., Jr.
Griffiths, Donald J.
Grimes, Fred M.
Gudbranson, Larry G.
Guffy, Wellard R.
Gustavson, Arthur R.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
Hamilton, Thomas, Jr.
Hamilton, Walter S.
Harris, Emerson M.
Hassenplug, John F.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Henderson, John S.
Hill, Jesse R., Jr.
Hill, Kenneth E.
Hill, Robert E.
Huisling, Don L.
Hurt, Richard O.
Jackson, Arthur D.
Jackson, George A.
Jerich, Frank J.
Jones, Rial C.
Kauder, Robert
Keefer, Frederick H.
Kelly, Robert C.
Kenealy, William E., Jr.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
Kibby, Darrell M.
Kick, David L.
King, Gerald H.
Kirch, Frederick J.
Kitko, John A.
Klatt, Ivan, Jr.
Kohl, Jacob D.
Koller, Bertil R.
Landfair, Robert W.
Lane, Henry L.
LaRose, Eugene M., Jr.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Leavitt, Jack B.
Leighty, Gary C.
Lewis, John C.
Lukens, Robert F.
Luoto, Hugo M., Jr.
Lynch, Robert E.
Madeira, Charles C.

Maier, Raymond G.
Maldonado, Teodosio
Margason, Bernard L.
Mason, Albert G.
Maxwell, Kenneth R.
Maxwell, Thomas A.
Mayer, William H.
McCoy, Thomas E., Jr.
McDonald, Francis E.
McKittick, Robert L.
McMahan, Paul T.
Meyers, Walter T.
Miller, Eric H., Jr.
Moore, William J.
Morrison, Quinn B.
Mullen, James V.
Nast, William E.
Needham, Thomas P.
Needley, Charles G.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Nelson, George W.
Newman, William H.
Oelkers, Harvey S.
Paul, John W.
Pearson, Lloyd I.
Peldquinn, Ferdinand C.
Phleger, Charles P.
Picht, George C.
Pokorny, Frank J., Jr.
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Postak, John N.
Postich, George
Potter, David W.
Reade, Lowell A.
Rech, Henry J.
Reynolds, Richard F.
Rhodes, Daniel M.
Rowley, Allyn E.
Ryan, William J.
Sabec, Edwin J.
Sammons, Joseph E.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Chaplain Corps

Auel, Carl A.
Baker, Marvin D.
Beck, John T.
Bevan, Leroy A.
Bigler, Robert L.
Bontrager, John K.
Boreczky, John V.
Carr, John F.
Clayton, Walter "B."
Clifford, William J.
Earnest, Ralph E.
Goad, John T.
Haroldsen, George E.
Holland, Harry W., Jr.
Ingebreton, Ervin D.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Johns, Harry D.
Keenon, John C.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Civil Engineer Corps

Armstrong, Merritt F.
Bannister, William H.
Belton, Edward H.
Biederman, Jack C.
Bodtke, David H.
Borberg, James E.
Clark, Ray C.
Coughlin, Richard D.
Dixon, Olin L., III
Doyle, Thomas J.
Fall, Raymond P., Jr.
Field, Robert T.
Gates, Paul R.
Geoly, Charles
Green, Lawrence J.
Hay, Erik K. F.
Houghton, Robert J.
Huffman, James I.
Huszar, Louis, Jr.
Keegan, Robert D.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Dental Corps

Albers, Delmar D.
Allensworth, Thomas M., Jr.

Samuelson, Charles H.
Sandrock, John E.
Saukas, Augustine G.
Schriner, James A.
Searles, Donald W.
Sebes, Edward A.
Shipley, Robert W.
Short, Carl W.
Slemons, Earl G., Jr.
Smith, Charles E.
Spears, Laurence
Stansbury, George L., III
Steege, Elvin H.
Strange, Hubert E., Jr.
Sumner, William M.
Teaford, Sidney J.
Tesch, Donald A.
Thomas, Magnus R.
Thompson, Gerald J.
Thurup, Carlyle V.
Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
Trueblood, Howard G.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Van Scoyoc, James S.
Vishneski, John S., Jr.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
Walsh, John E.
Wampler, Richard B.
Warren, Richard D.
Watt, Robert C.
Webb, George H.
Weisskopf, William M.
Wells, John L., Jr.
Wiener, Lawrence "S"
Wolfe, William D.
York, William B., Jr.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Chaplain Corps

Kopp, George P., Jr.
Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.
Linzy, Stanford E., Jr.
Miller, Harry R.
Morrill, Giles D.
Moser, Robert W.
Murphy, Milton G.
Reagan, Ernest McD., Jr.
Ruud, Carl E.
Schmid, Calvin F.
Scott, Knox O.
Seim, James E.
Simmons, David E.
Struthers, Basil H.
Wartes, Arthur J.
Wicker, Richard F., Jr.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Civil Engineer Corps

La Rue, Van B.
Mooney, Malcolm T.
Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
Rickels, Jack C.
Saravia, Benjamin L.
Seites, John H.
Surko, Alexander, Jr.
Sutherland, Andrew G.
Sutley, Robert M.
Taylor, James T.
Tombari, Henry A.
Whitehurst, Marshall N., Jr.
Williams, Curtis R., Jr.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Wilson, William L.
Wright, John A.
Zobel, William M.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Dental Corps

Baker, Ronald D.
Barbor, Gerald L.
Billotte, Alfred C.

Bodine, Theodore A., Jr.
Brault, Alfred O.
Brown, Kenneth E.
Cagle, John D.
Clark, Charles N., III
Collecchio, Emlido J.
Collier, Richard D.
Coombs, Paul S.
Corderman, Roy C., Jr.
Cotton, William R.
Davidson, Richard S.
Duncan, Donald E.
Eichel, Frederick P.
Fulcher, Clyde L.
Gaston, Robert A.
Gonder, Donald C.
Hall, Ollie V., Jr.
Hayes, Daniel E.
Haymore, Robert D.
Herr, Albert
Iandolo, Albert G.
Jackson, Clyde R.
Kaneshiro, Kenneth K.
Kawashima, Zitsuo
Keene, Harris J.
Kelly, James F.
Kleny, Richard J.
King, Gordon E.
Klima, James E.
Koutrakos, John
Lawrence, Joseph J., Jr.
Little, Richard W.
Lommel, Tennyson J.
Longton, Robert W.

To be lieutenant commanders, Medical Service Corps

Ambrose, Edward A.
Asche, Clifton A.
Bean, Willis E.
Bennett, Paul P., Jr.
Blackmon, Edward H.
Brown, Staley W.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
Buckley, Emanuel N.
Campbell, Howard B.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Connery, Horace J.
Costa, John F.
Daniel, Harold E.
Dean, Jerdon J.
Doucet, Louis E.
Dowling, James H.
Drake, Wilbur R.
Elliott, Gordon E.
Elmore, Milford D.
Ferris, Ezra F.
Flournoy, Rollin H.
Garver, Richard M.
Gill, Robert L.
Goding, Hubert M.
Green, Gale R.
Green, William J., Jr.
Gunn, John W.
Gutekunst, Richard R.
Haggis, Douglas E.
Harris, Albert C.
Hine, Charles M.
Holcombe, John T.
Honish, Joseph E.
Howard, Wallace R.
Huff, Samuel L.
Hughes, Robert G.
Hypes, Kenton, Jr.
Irvin, Ernest J.
Jones, Earmon R., Jr.
Jordan, Charles J.
Jula, Paul N.
Karrer, John L.
Kirsch, Jean P.
Knight, Jerry B.
Kolb, William H.
Koon, Robert L.
Larson, Alfhild L.
Leonard, Russell D.
Lewis, Thomas "W"
Liedtke, Fred E.
L'Italien, Robert V.
Longest, Clifford "B"
MacCracken, Raymond J.
Mangham, Alonzo L., Jr.
Matek, Edward D.
May, Carl R.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McConville, William E.
McDuffie, Wilbur B.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
Murphy, John S.
Newman, Buther L., Jr.
Nichols, Lavern E.
O'Neill, Joseph M.
Owen, Orville K.
Peake, Stanley C.
Pepper, Leonard A.
Ragle, Philip R.
Reynolds, Donald C.
Robinson, Donald J.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.
Smith, Denson L.
Steward, Edgar T.
Tapscott, Donald E.
Tedford, Charles F.
Verme, Dominic A.
Vise, Lee P.
Watts, Lloyd A.
Wells, John E.
White, Leland E.
Williams, Daniel N.
Wilson, James R.
Wolf, John W.
Wylie, David M.
Young, Johnny W.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Nurse Corps

Barr, Bette A.
Barry, Dorothy M.
Berkman, Virginia O.

Loo, Wallace D.
Mainous, Eugene G.
McDonald, Edwin E., Jr.
McLaughlin, Edward J.
McLeod, Carlton J.
Meister, Donald E.
Moffitt, William C.
Muller, Henry III
Nester, Calvin D.
Parsons, Richard L.
Pepek, Stanley E.
Pines, Barry E.
Prince, Richard D.
Rice, George W., Jr.
Romaniello, Ronald M.
Russell, John R.
Sand, Ralph E.
Sanderson, Alexander D.
Scharpf, Herbert O.
Schultz, Chester J., Jr.
Scott, James F.
Scott, William J.
Shiller, William R.
Stewart, William B., Jr.
Strauss, Philip W.
Timby, Robert E.
Tugwell, Howard S.
Ulrey, Richard D.
Vessey, Robert A.
Watkins, Eugene A., Sr.
Williams, John E., Jr.
Wirthlin, Milton R., Jr.
Witte, Ernest T.
Workman, James L.

To be lieutenant commanders, Medical Service Corps

Larson, Alfhild L.
Leonard, Russell D.
Lewis, Thomas "W"
Liedtke, Fred E.
L'Italien, Robert V.
Longest, Clifford "B"
MacCracken, Raymond J.
Mangham, Alonzo L., Jr.
Matek, Edward D.
May, Carl R.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McConville, William E.
McDuffie, Wilbur B.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
Murphy, John S.
Newman, Buther L., Jr.
Nichols, Lavern E.
O'Neill, Joseph M.
Owen, Orville K.
Peake, Stanley C.
Pepper, Leonard A.
Ragle, Philip R.
Reynolds, Donald C.
Robinson, Donald J.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.
Smith, Denson L.
Steward, Edgar T.
Tapscott, Donald E.
Tedford, Charles F.
Verme, Dominic A.
Vise, Lee P.
Watts, Lloyd A.
Wells, John E.
White, Leland E.
Williams, Daniel N.
Wilson, James R.
Wolf, John W.
Wylie, David M.
Young, Johnny W.

To be Lieutenant commanders, Nurse Corps

Beveridge, Robina W.
Bonczar, Jean C.
Bove, Mary L.

Bowen, Edith M.
Chart, Helen L.
Clark, Charlotte E.
Courtright, Barbara R.
Cowden, Elnora J.
DeMarco, Evelyn M.
Dinneen, Florence R.
Durkin, Veronica A.
Ellis, Jean E.
Fine, Rachel A.
Finn, Celine A.
Florence, Mary E.
Fogarty, Anna L.
Graves, Ellen G.
Green, Dorothy J.
Guccione, Geraldine M.
Gudsky, Patricia J.
Haile, Evelyn
Halverson, Ruth E.
Hennessey, Jane C.
Hessel, Jane C.
Higgins, Helen B.
Higgins, Mary E.
Job, Lucy A.
Kratz, Hedwig L.
Lanaghan, Harriett M.
Lawrence, Opal M.
Martin, Zuleime L.
Maun, Shirley J.

To be lieutenants, line

Abbott, William A.
Abriola, Ralph R.
Adams, James J.
Adams, Jessie W.
Adams, Ralph J.
Adams, Samuel W., Jr.
Aderholt, William L., Jr.
Adgent, Robert B.
Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
Ailes, Robert H.
Ake, Charles F.
Albero, Carl M.
Albritton, Hugh H., Jr.
Aldana, Louis P.
Alden, Robert F.
Alderson, Jack B.
Alexander, William T.
Allen, Archie E.
Allen, David L.
Allen, George S.
Allison, Kenneth L.
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
Altergott, Harvey K.
Alvarez, Franklin F.
Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
Ambos, Brooks L., Jr.
Anderson, Anders T.
Anderson, Archie A.
Anderson, Edwin K.
Anderson, Edward E., Jr.
Anderson, George W., III
Anderson, Peter N.
Anderson, Ronald M.
Anderson, Thomas J.
Anderton, John H.
Andrews, Charles H., Jr.
Appelhof, Gilbert A.
Araki, Makoto
Arcuni, Philip
Armbruster, James H.
Armstrong, Clarence E.
Arthur, Stanley R.
Arvin, Vernon E.
Atkins, Brandon T.
Atkins, Thomas M.
Atwell, Donald F., III
Aubert, Robert F.
Aucoin, James B.
Avis, Dwight E., Jr.
Aydt, Roger D.
Ayres, David R.
Balles, Ralph T.
Bailey, James E.
Bailey, Samuel M., Jr.
Baker, Donald A.
Baker, John K.
Baker, Peter A.
Baker, Ronald E.
Baldwin, Oa F.
Baldwin, Roger L.
Ball, Marvin L., Jr.
Ballantine, James C., Jr.
Ballou, Joseph F.
Balsley, Joseph W.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
Bangert, James E.
Bank, Milton H., II
Bankowski, Walter F.
Barbee, Walter E.
Barenti, Jerome C.
Barker, Ernest W.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Nathaniel C.
Barker, Richard H.
Barnes, Joel F.
Barnes, Paul D.
Barnhardt, David F.
Barnum, Craig L.
Barrett, Malcolm W.
Barry, Gerald E.
Barstow, Kenneth W.
Bartlett, Larry D.
Bartocci, John E.
Barton, Bryan W.
Barton, Robert L.
Bassett, Charles H., Jr.
Bassin, Paul H.
Bates, Homer R.
Bator, Stanley E., Jr.
Bauer, Herbert
Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
Baugh, Bernard R.
Baumstark, Richard B.
Bauschka, Patrick F.
Beagle, Clyde A.
Beamon, Joseph E., II
Beasley, Charles J.
Beatty, Don G.
Beatty, James R., III
Beck, Donald E.
Beene, Jerry T.
Behrends, Paul O.
Bell, Robert T.
Belto, Meryl A.
Bender, James E.
Bendit, Billy L.
Bennington, Bruce A.
Benson, Burton O.
Bentley, Robert E.

McCree, Dorothy N.
McHenry, Catherine M.
McKay, Bernadette A.
Mooney, Geraldine T.
Murashoff, Lina D.
Nielubowicz, Mary J.
O'Connor, Margaret B.
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Loah G.
Otis, Clara A.
Pampush, Ruth G.
Parker, Viola J.
Prencipe, Edith A.
Racke, Marguerite J.
Rigsby, Helen M.
Sampson, Natalie T.
Shelton, Mildred L.
Shepherd, Luana
Sherman, Miriam C.
Shirk, Mary L.
Simmons, Harriet A.
Soles, Hazel E.
Spence, Ruth G.
Sterling, Elinor B.
Stowell, Ellen J.
Warren, Ellen G.
Wilson, Katherine
Zanetti, Jean M.

- Benz, Philip H.
Benz, Valentine G.
Bergfeld, Rudolph P.
III
Bernard, Eugene C.
Best, David E.
Betha, Carl L.
Betterton, Thomas C.
Betts, William M.
Bevan, John A., Jr.
Bewley, Jack D.
Bickmore, Edward C.
Jr.
Biele, Charles E., Jr.
Billings, Charles H.
Binger, James D.
Binsfeld, Arthur J.
Bird, Richard E.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Bishop, Doyse R.
Bishop, Larry D.
Black, Arnold E., Jr.
Black, Richard O.
Black, Robert J.
Blackner, Ronald K.
Blair, Frank
Blake, Raymond G.
Blanchard, Lewis T.
Blasko, John E.
Blessing, George R.
Bletch, James W.
Bloodorn, James J.
Blouin, Robert E.
Bode, Michael G.
Boerner, Delbert D.
Boggs, Harold A., Jr.
Boguslawski, William T.
Boice, Frank B.
Boling, James R.
Bolton, John M.
Bond, Charles S.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Bornstein, Paul A.
Bostick, James H.
Boulder, Raymond S.
Bower, Bruce B.
Bower, Richard D.
Bowers, John P.
Bowers, Richard F.
Bowers, Robert L.
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyles, Harlan H.
Boyne, Peter B.
Bradford, "J" "W"
Bradley, Frederick L.
Jr.
Brandenburg, Robert L.
Branscomb, Max "G"
Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Brazzon, Robert
Breckon, Richard L.
Breed, William L.
Bremser, William J.
Jr.
Brenner, Leroy E.
Brennock, Robert F.
Brewton, Edward A.
Briggs, Richard W., Jr.
Brightman, James M.
Britton, Jack B.
Bronson, Edward F.
Brookes, Allan G., Jr.
Brooks, Dennis M.
Brooks, James D., Jr.
Brooks, Otis McK.
Brothers, John W., Jr.
Brown, Charles E., II
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, Howard A.
Brown, Kenneth C.
Brown, Parke L., Jr.
Brown, Peter J.
Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Randall R.
Brown, Roger W., Jr.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, William S., Jr.
Brown, William T.
Browne, Thomas M.
Brownell, Paul E.
Browning, Wayne B.
Broyles, Bill R.
Bruni, Richard L.
Brunns, Wallace R.
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, Don M.
Bryant, George W.
Buchwald, Robert D.
Buck, David E.
Buck, Wilbur P.
Buckland, Rann K.
Buckley, Jimmy L.
Buckner, James A.
Bueche, Arthur H., Jr.
Bull, John S.
Bullene, Richard E.
Bullock, Harold O., Jr.
Buono, Robert T.
Burcher, Philip E.
Burchett, Chester W.
Burgess, Eric C.
Burgess, John E.
Burke, Thomas J.
Burleigh, David P.
Burleson, Frank M.
Burns, James W.
Burns, James M.
Burns, John D.
Burnside, Cecil A.
Burpo, James H.
Burrows, Jack
Burrows, James B.
Burson, Donald L.
Burton, James L., Jr.
Burton, Robert A., Jr.
Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Robert P.
Butterfield, David L.
Buxton, Donald G.
Byers, Carl A.
Byers, John M.
Bynon, Robert W.
Byrom, James T.
Caciola, James J.
Cahill, Lionel A., Jr.
Cain, William L.
Caine, Paul E.
Caldwell, Leland C.
Caldwell, Theodore E.
Calhan, James R.
Callnin, William J.
Camp, Joe D.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Norman D.
Campbell, Robyn M., Jr.
Campbell, William, Jr.
Capley, Joe H.
Carder, Denny M.
Carlson, Richard A.
Jr.
Carpenter, Rex N.
Carr, Samuel L.
Carroll, John L.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carson, William G.
Carter, Herbert E.
Carter, Richard A.
Cashman, James M.
Castle, Ronald G.
Catron, Jerry M.
Chaffee, Roger B.
Chalmers, William C.
Chancy, Thomas M.
Chanslor, Richard M.
Chapman, Rodney M.
Charles, Richard N.
Chauncey, Arvin R.
Check, Leonard L.
Chestnut, Lawrence, Jr.
Christensen, John E., Jr.
Christensen, Ejnar S., Jr.
Christenson, Robert W. S.
Clancy, Wilbert C.
Clark, Allen H.
Clark, Charles F.
Clark, Loren L.
Clarke, Douglas L.
Cleary, Patrick R.
Clevenger, Redmond L.
Clock, Harry S.
Cochran, William F.
Cocotis, Bruce T.
Coen, Francis M.
Coffey, Robert C.
Coffman, William R., Jr.
Cole, William M., II
Coleman, James J.
Coleman, Joseph S., Jr.
Collard, Keith P.
Collins, David M.
Comer, Robert F.
Comstock, George W.
Condon, Robert E.
Conklin, Andrew J.
Conner, Eugene D.
Connery, John D.
Converse, Henry B.
Cook, Herman K.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Thomas L. P.
Coolbaugh, Jesse D.
Cooley, Donald E.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, David S.
Cooper, John D., Jr.
Corbell, Rodolphe N.
Cordek, David
Cordle, "J" "T"
Cornell, John P.
Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corrigan, Richard W.
Coulbourn, Samuel W.
Cowan, Terrance E.
Cowling, Cecil G.
Cox, Edward F.
Cox, James P.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Robert L.
Cox, William W.
Coyne, Thomas
Coyne, William L.
Cracknell, William H., Jr.
Crahan, Patrick J.
Craig, Harry E.
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Creswell, Lawrence K.
Crew, Perry L.
Crichton, Ian R.
Croghan, Clayton D.
Cromer, Charles C.
Cross, Claude C.
Crouse, David R.
Crow, Claron D.
Crowe, William M., Jr.
Crowell, Alton L., Jr.
Crozier, Ronald L.
Cueroni, Lee A.
Culberson, George W., Jr.
Cullen, Joseph P.
Cumlidge, Kenneth E.
Cummins, Clarence M.
Cundari, Francis L.
Cunningham, Shaun
Curlee, John L.
Curry, Newell L.
Curry, William H., Jr.
Daly, Frederick T., III
Daly, John S.
Dammann, Frederick O.
Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Louis D.
Daniels, Richard O.
Darby, Thomas E., Jr.
Daughenbaugh, Robert L.
Daum, Richard A.
Davenport, Charles A.
David, Ralph H.
Davidson, John M.
Davis, Charles L.
Davis, Donald V.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Philip C.
Davis, Ralph N.
Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert E.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davison, Gregory L.
Dawkins, Heibert C., Jr.
Day, James O.
Day, Raymond D.
Dean, Bill C.
Debode, Donald G.
Deboxtel, Lawrence L., Jr.
Decarlo, John A.
Deegan, Robert F.
Deesch, Earl H.
Defibaugh, Carl F., Jr.
DeGress, Francis B., III
DeGroot, Henry, Jr.
De Lashmitt, Robert E.
Demarest, Joseph G., III
DeMars, Bruce
Dennis, Jefferson R., Jr.
Dewey, Richard F.
Dewitt, Michael T.
Dickens, Russell J.
Dickens, Russell D.
Dickey, James P.
Dickey, John E.
Dickey, Kenneth R.
Didier, Jacob P., Jr.
Disher, John S.
Dixon, John C.
Dixon, Ned E.
Dodd, Jimmy J.
Doeschot, Kenneth G.
Dollenmeyer, James K.
Dolliver, Richard H.
Donahue, John R.
Donnan, Earl L.
Donnegan, Richard
Donnelly, Thomas F.
Doragh, Robert A.
Doran, Daniel F.
Doubroff, Jerome S.
Doughdrill, Charles W.
Dove, Ray W., Jr.
Drew, Kenneth W.
Duffield, Leslie H.
Duffy, Leonard C.
Dugan, Ferdinand C., III
Dulik, Andrew F.
Dumas, Paul J.
Dunham, William C.
Dunlap, James H.
Dunlap, Stanton P.
Durr, James E.
Dvorak, Robert
Dwyer, William L.
Dyer, Thomas E.
Dyer, William E.
Eades, Thomas A.
Earhart, Kay E.
Earnest, William E.
Eason, Ward R.
Edney, Leon A.
Edwards, Walter J.
Egan, Robert W.
Eiken, Donald N.
Eisele, Roderick L.
Eldredge, Floyd W.
Eley, Clifford H., III
Elich, Robert L.
Eller, James B.
Ellingson, Norman D.
Elliot, Arthur J., II
Elliot, Robert J.
Ellsworth, Warren R., Jr.
Elwood, Robert W.
Emmett, Richard F.
Endo, Norio B.
Engelhardt, James H.
English, Glenn A.
Enkeboll, Richard E.
Eoff, Albert W., II
Epstein, Julian D.
Erikson, Theodore W.
Ermis, Leroy C.
Essig, John R.
Estes, William B., Jr.
Eulenstein, Karl H.
Evans, DeWitt C., III
Evans, James R.
Evans, Philip R.
Everding, Edward J.
Everly, Vernon R.
Fahey, William F.
Fahrney, David L.
Fairley, Carl R.
Fannin, Grover F.
Farley, Edward B., Jr.
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Feingersch, Allen
Felt, Bruce C.
Fernald, Lloyd W., Jr.
Ferro, James L.
Fickenscher, David B.
Fidelibus, William T., Jr.
Fidler, Richard A.
Field, Benjamin H.
Fields, Chester J., Jr.
Fields, David E.
Figg, Charles E.
Filbert, Arthur S.
Finley, John L.
Finn, William A.
Firey, Roger S.
Fischer, Warren H.
Fishburn, John H.
Fishburn, Lewis R.
Fisher, Harvey E.
Fisher, Norman E.
Fisher, Richard L.
Fitch, Dee N.
Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgibbons, George P.
Flage, Donald W.
Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
Fleming, Bruce S.
Fleming, Duncan A.
Florko, Donald J.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, John J.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Foley, Jerold W.
Folmer, Lloyd D., Jr.
Foote, Ernest D.
Ford, Frank R., Jr.
Ford, Lyndall C.
Ford, Randolph W.
Fordice, James E.
Foreman, Merlin L. R.
Foresman, James H., III
Forhan, William P.
Fosko, Paul D.
Foss, Robert N.
Foster, Naylor C., Jr.
Fournier, Joseph O.
Fowler, Jim B.
Fowler, Norwood V., Jr.
Fox, George R., Jr.
Fox, John F. J.
Fox, Robert F.
Fox, Thomas R.
France, Morgan M.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franklin, William P.
Frankoski, John P.
Frazier, Donald L.
Frelliche, Harold J.
French, Douglas "E"
French, Frederick A.
Frey, Robert D.
Friederich, Bruce
Fritz, David L.
Fritz, Wayne R.
Frommer, Paul S.
Frye, William J.
Fuller, Dale G.
Funderburk, Jeryl D.
Furey, Edwin M.
Furrow, Donald E.
Furtado, Francis J.
Fyles, Roderick A.
Gaduette, Dudley A.
Gallagher, Joseph G.
Gallion, Lawrence B.
Gambill, Richard K.
Gant, James R.
Garcia, Rodolfo C.
Gardella, John K.
Gardner, James R.
Garrett, Roger D.
Garvey, James J.
Gash, John A.
Gatto, Paul J.
Gault, Harry R.
Gautier, Walter J.
Gearin, Billy D.
Gehrig, Jerome C.
Gentz, Richard C.
George, Troy H., Jr.
Geraldson, Elmer L.
Gerry, Donald D.
Giambattista, Michele D.
Gibson, Alfred P.
Gibson, Douglas B.
Gilbert, Bertrand M.
Gilchrist, James L.
Gilchrist, William F.
Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Gillespie, John P.
Gilliland, Lawrence A., Jr.
Gimber, Harry M. S., III
Ginn, James T.
Ginther, Larry L.
Gladis, John T.
Glancy, Robert J.
Glickman, Thomas W.
Godbey, Thomas N.
Godefroy, Pierre L.
Goggin, Richard E.
Golder, Thomas V.
Goldstein, Lawrence B.
Goldstone, Ronald G.
Goodwin, James B.
Googe, James P., Jr.
Gookin, Robert B.
Gordon, Victor
Gott, William B.
Gowans, George K.
Grady, Roger D.
Graf, David L.
Graft, Howard B.
Graft, Paul E.
Graham, George D.
Grant, Edward J.
Grant, Howard W., Jr.
Gray, Olin A.
Green, Richard F.
Greene, George C.
Greene, William H., Jr.
Greenelsen, Kermit W.
Greenhoe, Duane F.
Greer, Joe C.
Greer, Robert E.
Grelling, David S.
Griffin, David H.
Griffith, Dwaine O.
Griffiths, Jerry R.
Grimes, John E.
Grimes, Thomas W.
Grosup, William D.
Gruendi, Paul L.
Grunawalt, Richard J.
Gubitosi, Michael J.
Gudmundson, Marvin L.
Guernsey, Charles H.
Gulliver, Victor S.
Gunderson, Donald H.
Gustafson, Charles B.
Guttery, Thomas H.
Gwin, John O.
Haack, Norman E.

- Haas, William R.
Hagen, Dale N.
Hale, Bill J.
Haliday, George W.
Hall, Charles R., III
Hall, Gordon B., Jr.
Hall, John O.
Hamilton, John E.
Hamlett, John W.
Hammack, John E.
Hammock, Donald P.
Hamrick, Raymond J.
Hancock, Gus H., Jr.
Handley, Paul L.
Hanna, Ronald F.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hannify, Michael F.
Hanson, Ralph E.
Harjehausen, Lawrence O.
Harkins, Vyrion V., Jr.
Harner, Charles F., Jr.
Harney, Patrick F.
Harre, James L.
Harrington, John R.
Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, Roger W.
Hart, Raymond J.
Hart, Vernon D.
Hartfelder, Richard F.
Hartley, Donald A.
Hartman, Anthony G.
Hartman, Phillip G.
Hartman, Richard D.
Hartshorn, David R.
Harvey, Walter D.
Hastie, Robert K.
Hatcher, Jerry M.
Haven, Robert R., Jr.
Havens, Harry S.
Haviland, Carlton E.
Hawk, Allan H.
Hawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Hawkins, Leroy T.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Haworth, Alvin G., Jr.
Hayford, James E.
Haynes, Harold J.
Healy, Jerry F., Jr.
Heekin, John P.
Hegeman, Joey W.
Helsner, Robert I., Jr.
Hellewell, John S.
Hellman, John S.
Hemphill, Allen P., Jr.
Henken, Raymond N.
Henry, Michael C.
Henry, Patrick, Jr.
Herbert, Frank R.
Herbert, Leo E.
Herbert, Roger G.
Herd, Robert V.
Hering, Frederick L.
Herring, George G., III
Hessler, John L.
Hester, James H.
Hewitt, Paul E.
Hewitt, Wesley C.
Heyde, John S., Jr.
Heyduck, William R.
Heyward, Shannon D.
Hibbard, Grant W.
Hickman, Thomas W.
Hiebner, Robert J., Jr.
Higgins, John J.
Higgins, William H.
Higginson, John J.
Hildenbrand, Daniel C.
Hine, Paul M., Jr.
Hines, Dean H.
Hippis, Carl E.
Hite, Philip R.
Hix, Jack M.
Hobler, William J., Jr.
Hodapp, David H.
Hodges, Virgil C.
Hoffmann, John M.
Hogan, Lawrence M.
Holland, Joe L.
- Holland, Tommy L.
Holland, Wylen R.
Holmes, Henry D., Jr.
Holmes, Wayne M.
Holt, Arvil A.
Holt, John A., III
Holt, Shirley W.
Holtzclaw, John W.
Holzschuh, Jacob R.
Hooper, John R., Jr.
Hoppe, Herbert L.
Horne, Ronald G.
Horsefield, John E.
Horsley, George W., Jr.
Horton, Jerry D.
Hosey, "H" "P"
Hough, Richard A.
Hough, Van Q.
Houghum, Leon P.
Howard, Harland C.
Howard, John A.
Howard, Richard A.
Howay, John W.
Howe, Frederic N., Jr.
Howe, John E.
Howe, Jonathan T.
Howell, Thomas A., Jr.
Hower, James J.
Howland, John H.
Huebel, Melvin R.
Hughey, Ira A.
Humphrey, Harlow B.
Hungerford, Emerson A.
Hunsicker, Edmund K.
Hutchinson, Charles K.
Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Leo G.
Hyde, Ronald P.
Ike, William F.
Irlacher, Leonard T.
Irrgang, Ferdinand C., Jr.
Isenhour, William J.
Isquith, David A.
Jackets, Michael E.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, James P., Jr.
Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jacobson, Lennart R.
James, James E. M.
James, Thomas P., Jr.
Jarrell, Jerry D.
Jarrett, Edwin B.
Jasperson, Michael
Jaynes, David W.
Jennings, Robert L.
Jensen, George W.
Jerome, John D.
Jines, Milton L.
Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Johnson, Leonard W., II
Johnson, Paul S., Jr.
Johnson, Phillip S.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Verlyn D.
Johnson, Wendell N.
Johnston, Harold B., Jr.
Jones, Colin M.
Jones, Daniel P., Jr.
Jones, Harold L.
Jones, Jack E.
Jones, Robert "F"
Jordan, David C.
Jordan, Dennis R.
Jordan, William T.
Junghans, Peter A.
Jurgens, Robert A.
Kall, Norman H.
Kaiser, Edward R., Jr.
Kalinowski, Raymond S.
- Kampen, Kenneth B.
Kantor, Clifford S.
Kapustka, Herman L.
Karr, Harold L.
Kaseote, George
Kassebaum, David L.
Katz, Bennett D.
Katzen, Murry
Kaufer, Richard A.
Kauffman, William C.
Kay, William G.
Keathley, James W.
Keller, Joseph A.
Keith, John F.
Kemper, Ralph C.
Kennedy, Peter P.
Kennedy, Thomas C.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Kennelly, Bernard J.
Kenney, Daniel J.
Kenney, Theodore C., Jr.
Kensinger, Roy A.
Kentopp, Donald E.
Kerman, William O., Jr.
Kerr, William A., Jr.
Kershner, Robert L.
Kesteloot, Robert W.
Keyes, James L.
Kiefer, Martin D.
Kiel, Richard H.
Killingsworth, Monte L.
Kilpatrick, Thomas E.
Kimball, Paul E.
King, Carleton J., Jr.
King, James W.
King, John D.
Kiper, William "D"
Kirklund, Thomas J., III
Kirkpatrick, Wayne A.
Kittleman, Donald L.
Klein, Argyle G.
Klinger, Gerald F.
Klish, Theodore, Jr.
Knapp, Daniel L.
Knapp, Montelle N.
Knapp, Ralph E.
Knight, Dennis K.
Kniveton, Robert
Knodle, William C.
Knott, Richard C.
Knowles, Russell, Jr.
Knutson, Jerry G.
Koch, Joseph W., Jr.
Koehler, Norman E., III
Kohn, Arthur F.
Kolstad, Thomas C.
Komp, Richard L.
Korthe, James D.
Koster, Alfred M., IV
Kraft, Robert M.
Kral, Anthony J.
Kramer, Theodore R., Jr.
Kratch, David A.
Krehmeyer, James A.
Krekel, Lyman E.
Kremin, Richard A.
Kriewall, Royce L.
Krilowicz, Thomas J.
Krueger, Milton E.
Kruse, Donald C.
Kuck, Donald L.
Kuehler, Donald E.
Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kunkel, Larry D.
Kuntz, David S.
Kurihara, Thomas M.
Kushner, David A.
Laird, Travis H.
Laitsch, Lowell C.
Lamay, Urban R., Jr.
Lamb, Larry R.
Lambert, Raymond A.
Lampert, George E., Jr.
Lancaster, William L., Jr.
- Lang, William R.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Lange, William R.
Langholz, Marcus J.
Langston, Nicholas D.
Lanman, George M.
Larabee, Kent W.
Larson, Charles W., II
LaSalle, Rene R.
Lasko, Harvey D.
Lassey, Karl I.
Lavole, Louis A.
Law, James E.
Lawler, Casimir E.
Leahy, Richard N.
Leahy, Vincent J.
Leban, Carl
LeBlanc, Thomas D.
Leech, Robert J.
Leeds, Rene W.
Legare, Maurice T.
Lerner, Albert M.
Leslie, William N.
Lester, William E.
Leuschner, Robert L., Jr.
Levin, Richard R.
Lewis, Eddie C.
Lewis, Marwood D.
Lindstrom, Harry E.
Lineback, Harry W.
Lino, Norman J.
Lipscomb, Jack C.
Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, John G., Jr.
Livingston, Gill F.
Lockwood, Robert K., Jr.
Loewenthal, Robert G.
Loman, Cleve E., Jr.
Lomheim, Louis G.
Longton, Andrew P.
Lonnegren, Robert C.
Love, John J.
Lowe, Gary B.
Lowery, Needham H.
Lowrance, Douglas L.
Lowry, Abner P.
Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Luehring, Davidson
Lueker, Wendell H.
Luetschwager, Edward E.
Luke, Charles T., Jr.
Luke, Robert A.
Lynch, Clayton W.
MacArthur, James D.
MacCubbin, George E., Jr.
MacDonald, Richard W.
MacGregor, John L.
Mack, Robert J.
Mackay, Richard W.
MacKenzie, Bruce E.
MacNichol, Malcolm S.
Madara, Richard J.
Maddox, Ralph R.
Madouse, Richard L.
Magner, Lawrence R.
Magnus, Ralph S.
Maguire, Thomas J.
Mahon, Edward J., Jr.
Mahony, Terrence M.
Malley, Kenneth B.
Malvin, Frederick B.
Mandel, Philip N.
Mann, John P.
Mansfield, James L.
Marcantonio, Anthony W.
Marcom, James C.
Marcus, Robert U.
Margedant, John W.
Marin, Richard
Markley, Wade E.
Marks, Arthur J.
Marnane, Thomas A.
Marovich, Michael
- Marriott, Michael J.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marsh, David R.
Marshall, Harris A., Jr.
Marshall, Harold C.
Marshall, Raymond E.
Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
Martin, James J., Jr.
Martin, John S., Jr.
Martin, Marshall W.
Martin, William G.
Martinson, George P.
Marxer, Hugo E.
Massimino, Andrew S.
Masten, Lawrence E.
Masterson, James E.
Mathis, John P.
Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, Gary D.
Maurer, Earl T.
Maxwell, Matthew T., III
May, James L.
May, Robert J.
May, Robert C.
McAuliffe, Jack M.
McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
McCabe, Ebe C., Jr.
McCampbell, Richard L.
McCandless, John E.
McCart, Benjamin H.
McCarthy, James F.
McCartney, William A.
McCauley, George K.
McCauley, Hugh W.
McCauley, John W.
McClary, Richard C.
McClure, Gilson K., Jr.
McClure, William F.
McConnel, Richard A., Jr.
McConville, James E.
McCormick, Bruce A.
McCracken, Richard L.
McCulloch, James M.
McCullough, Lawrence E.
McCullough, Robert F.
McCutchan, Milton L.
McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDermott, Joseph T.
McDonald, Gerald W.
McDonald, Richard P.
McDonough, Vincent P.
McEachern, William H., Jr.
McEnaney, Thomas J., Jr.
McFarland, James S.
McGahey, Jack M.
McGee, Donald J.
McGill, James A.
McGinty, Thomas J.
McGlasson, Daniel E.
McGlynn, James R.
McGrail, Charles R., Jr.
McGuigan, David B.
McHenry, William G.
McHugh, Charles E.
McHugh, John T.
McHugh, William M.
McIndoe, James E.
McKamey, John B.
McKee, Junious A., Jr.
McKenna, Michael F.
McKinnon, Patrick C.
McKittrick, Edward R., Jr.
McKnight, James D.
McManes, Albert S.
McManes, Kenmore R.
McMichael, William L.
McMichael, George L.
McMillen, Kenneth A.
- McMorris, John A., II
McMurry, William T.
McMurtry, Thomas C.
McNally, James A.
McNeese, Carter V.
McNerney, James L.
McNichols, John P., Jr.
McPherson, Roger B.
McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
McVay, Wesley J., Jr.
Mead, Gerald R.
Meaux, Richard P.
Meehan, James F.
Meeker, Quentin S.
Megehee, Louis D., Jr.
Meinick, Norbert W.
Mendenhall, Ivan F.
Meneke, Kenneth N.
Mericle, David L.
Metz, Frederick J.
Meukow, Walter T.
Meyer, Allan G.
Meyer, Richard E.
Miceli, Joseph D.
Mickle, William McE.
Middleton, John E.
Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Miklos, Thomas J.
Miles, John I.
Millard, David R.
Miller, Charles H., Jr.
Miller, David G.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Edmund B.
Miller, George
Miller, Peter R.
Miller, Robert C.
Mills, Albert
Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Neal O.
Mills, Thad W.
Milner, Harry M.
Miniter, Howard E., Jr.
Missailidis, Stephen
Misura, Paul
Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, David L.
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Henry H.
Mitchell, Ralph M.
Mitchell, Raymond F., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Modeen, Victor D.
Modrak, George P.
Moester, Milton P., Jr.
Moke, Paul D.
Molenda, Paul H.
Monroe, Vincent D.
Montgomery, Donald J.
Mooney, Andrew R.
Mooney, Harold L., Jr.
Moore, Aubrey A., Jr.
Moore, David W.
Moore, Harry R., Jr.
Moore, Jimmie R.
Moore, John W.
Moore, Rowland W.
Moore, Thomas R., Jr.
Moran, Charles K., Jr.
Moran, Richard A.
Morcerf, Lester A., Jr.
Moreau, Ronald F.
Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
Morgan, Rawls B.
Morgan, William O.
Moriarty, Jack O.
Morris, David R.
Morsches, Robert W.
Morton, Stewart M.
Moss, Robert L.
Mott, Louis D.
Mozley, Edwin A.
Mueller, John A.
Mullen, Cornelius W.
Mumford, Robert E., Jr.
Munson, John H.

- Murdoch, Thomas McC.
 Murphy, David R.
 Murphy, Edward J., Jr.
 Murphy, James H.
 Murphy, John A.
 Murphy, Michael A.
 Murray, Gerald W.
 Murray, Thomas R.
 Myatt, Kenneth E.
 Myers, Dale P.
 Myers, Stephen G.
 Nace, Larry D.
 Nagel, Richard C.
 Natz, Daryl C.
 Neary, Joseph F.
 Neeley, Wallace W.
 Nelson, Bobby C.
 Nelson, John "T"
 Nelson, Robert E.
 Nesbit, Arthur M.
 Nesbit, Gerald E.
 Nevin, Robert F.
 Nevins, Peter G.
 Nevitt, James E.
 Newcomb, Zeanious L.
 Newell, John W.
 Newell, Richard E.
 Newton, Clifford A.
 Newton, Robert L., Jr.
 Ney, Kenneth L.
 Nicholas, Joseph
 Nichols, Richard D.
 Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
 Nider, Kenneth E.
 Nielsen, Niel P.
 Noggle, George A., Jr.
 Nolan, Bruce F.
 Noll, Charles F.
 Normand, Eugene J.
 North, David M.
 Nucci, Eugene M.
 O'Brien, George E.
 O'Connell, Daniel J.
 O'Connell, James J.
 O'Connor, Paul
 O'Dea, Thomas V.
 O'Donohoe, Joseph P.
 O'Donovan, James P.
 Ogle, Peter W.
 O'Hara, James P., Jr.
 O'Keefe, Timothy R.
 Olmer, Lionel H.
 Ondak, Gerald S.
 O'Neill, James P., Jr.
 Ong, Richard E.
 Oppedahl, Phillip E.
 Ore, William E.
 O'Rourke, Bernard F.
 Osborne, Dale H.
 Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
 O'Sullivan, Joseph F.
 Otto, Max W.
 Overholser, Merlin K.
 Owen, William L., Jr.
 Owens, Darrel D.
 Owens, Robert S.
 Owens, Sherman H.
 Paal, William T.
 Padgett, Ervin E., Jr.
 Page, Arthur "M"
 Page, Henry H., Jr.
 Pakradooni, Haig H., III
 Palmer, Edward J.
 Palmer, Gerald A.
 Palmer, Stanley B.
 Palmer, William N., II
 Pape, Frank F.
 Pappas, Jimmy
 Parcell, Kenneth H.
 Parent, Theodore R.
 Parker, Ronald H.
 Parker, Thomas W.
 Parkhurst, Sherwood L.
 Parnell, Ural C.
 Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
 Partlow, James G.
 Patrick, Andrew K.
 Patterson, Donald R.
 Patterson, Ralph A., Jr.
 Patterson, Dale W.
 Patterson, Dale K.
 Paul, John S.
 Peace, John D., III
 Peacher, Robert W.
 Peake, Stephen R.
 Pearigen, Jare M.
 Pearson, James W.
 Pearson, Merton A.
 Pedersen, Dan A.
 Peerenboom, William H.
 Pelphrey, Gary R.
 Pember, Norman L.
 Penley, Paul E.
 Peresluha, Edmund J., II
 Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
 Perro, Michael A., Jr.
 Perry, Leonard G.
 Perry, Richard C.
 Perry, Timothy J.
 Persons, George R.
 Pestolis, Thomas C.
 Peters, Frank J., Jr.
 Peterson, Kenneth D.
 Peterson, Laurel C.
 Peterson, Paul A.
 Pharis, Wade J.
 Phelps, Freddie J.
 Phillips, George
 Phillips, John M.
 Phillips, James M.
 Philo, Arthur R.
 Piche, Paul D.
 Picher, Francis X., Jr.
 Piersall, Charles H., Jr.
 Pingel, Leon J.
 Piotti, Walter T., Jr.
 Pirotte, James H.
 Pistotnik, James J.
 Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
 Pocklington, William D.
 Pollard, Ronald T.
 Poole, James R.
 Porcaro, Anthony P.
 Porter, Donald H.
 Porter, Richard G.
 Potter, Robert H., Jr.
 Pounds, Philip C., Jr.
 Powell, Daniel G.
 Prien, Richard K.
 Pritchard, Joseph R.
 Promersberger, Edward S.
 Propst, William F.
 Prosser, Norman E.
 Pruett, Ronald L.
 Przekurat, Eugene E.
 Puerling, Peter N.
 Pundt, Cameron A.
 Purvis, Samuel M.
 Pyle, Loyd E.
 Quantock, Charles W.
 Quast, Harry S.
 Queen, Ronald J.
 Quigley, Francis J.
 Quinn, James H.
 Rae, Paul O.
 Ragan, Charles P.
 Raines, Frederick L.
 Rankin, Andrew M., II
 Rau, Ronald E.
 Ray, William J.
 Raymond, Calvin D.
 Reader, James M.
 Reagan, Louis L.
 Ream, Ronald L.
 Rebber, Roger B.
 Reed, Benjamin W., Jr.
 Reed, Robert B., Jr.
 Reese, Paul J.
 Reeve, William F.
 Reeves, Roy B.
 Reich, Merrill D.
 Reichart, Harold L., Jr.
 Reid, James R., III
 Reiley, Ralph H., Jr.
 Rempt, Henry F., Jr.
 Renner, Richard B.
 Rentle, Norman L.
 Repass, Donald E.
 Reynolds, Robert L.
 Reynolds, Ted "W"
 Rhoads, John D.
 Rice, Lloyd A.
 Rice, Loren M.
 Rich, Roger L., Jr.
 Richards, Warren D.
 Richardson, John D., Jr.
 Richter, Ralph, Jr.
 Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
 Rigg, Richard G.
 Rigney, Robert J., Jr.
 Rij, Michael A., Jr.
 Riley, Charles E.
 Rimson, Ira J.
 Ring, Stewart A.
 Ripple, James E., Jr.
 Ritchie, Sherwood L.
 Robbins, Philip D.
 Roberson, Harold J.
 Roberts, Gordon W.
 Roberts, James J.
 Robertson, Lester S.
 Robinson, John W.
 Robinson, Kenneth F.
 Robinson, Robert G.
 Roche, Denis P.
 Roe, James E.
 Roesser, Walter V., Jr.
 Rogers, David T.
 Rollman, Gordon L.
 Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
 Romoser, William K., Jr.
 Ronni, James A.
 Rook, Wilson C.
 Rose, Rufus R.
 Rositzke, Robert H.
 Ross, Norman A.
 Ross, Thomas E.
 Rothrauff, Thomas B.
 Roubik, Arthur F.
 Roudebush, Daniel L.
 Roundtree, Jack L.
 Rowland, Richard P.
 Ruchala, Joseph F.
 Rucks, Ronald A.
 Russell, Earl H.
 Russell, Richard E.
 Russell, Richard W.
 Rutemiller, Oren G., Jr.
 Ryan, Patrick F.
 Rydzewski, James C.
 Ryll, Ronald R.
 Sachtjen, Jerry W.
 Sakey, Leyon D.
 Salisbury, Jack S.
 Salley, Alexander McQ.
 Salovitch, Edward M.
 Sanders, Franklin H.
 Sanders, Kit C.
 Santoro, Paul J.
 Saracco, Robert L.
 Sawyer, Tommy D.
 Scahill, Lawrence J.
 Scales, Richard H.
 Schaffer, Dennis N.
 Schaffer, David G.
 Schaper, Delmar O.
 Scheible, Jack W.
 Schell, John J.
 Schenk, Parley G.
 Schildhauer, Edward W.
 Schilling, Noel K.
 Schimming, John G.
 Schlitz, Preston G., Jr.
 Schleicher, Richard J.
 Schmidt, Arnold C.
 Schneider, Henry J.
 Schneidewind, Gilbert P.
 Schoeff, Kendall "E"
 Schroder, Donald C.
 Schultz, Alwin L.
 Schulz, Paul H.
 Schumacher, Duane O.
 Schussler, Gerald A.
 Schwaab, Denis T.
 Schwartz, Hugh L.
 Scofield, Gary A.
 Scott, Douglas L.
 Scott, Thomas W.
 Seaman, Roy E.
 Searcy, William P.
 Sears, Gilbert H., Jr.
 Sears, Johnny M.
 Secor, Richard A.
 Sedor, Gerald
 Segelhorst, Herbert E.
 Seidel, Melvin L.
 Seng, William R.
 Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
 Shaffer, Clyde H.
 Shay, James E.
 Sherman, David D.
 Sherrill, John T., Jr.
 Sheubrooks, William L.
 Shewmaker, John B.
 Shields, Ronald M.
 Shimmings, George R.
 Shirley, Fred E., Jr.
 Shirley, Gerald B., Jr.
 Shirley, Vernon D.
 Sholl, Theodore G.
 Shores, Howard V.
 Sick, Gary G.
 Siegel, Kent R.
 Siegrist, Edward A., Jr.
 Sierra, Edward P.
 Sigg, Earl C.
 Sillery, Charles D.
 Silvia, Charles P.
 Simerly, Glen E.
 Simmons, Robert R.
 Simone, Thomas J.
 Simonton, Bennet S.
 Simpson, Benjamin M., III
 Simpson, James H.
 Simpson, John E., II
 Simsarian, James R.
 Sitek, Thomas W.
 Skelly, Harold J.
 Skelly, John F.
 Slater, Larue D.
 Sloan, Dennis Y.
 Sloane, Stephen B.
 Slusar, Donald A.
 Smith, Albert R.
 Smith, Bertram D., Jr.
 Smith, Clarence L.
 Smith, Clyde A.
 Smith, Don L.
 Smith, Donald D.
 Smith, George C.
 Smith, Jimmy F.
 Smith, Lee O.
 Smith, Leon L., Jr.
 Smith, Leroy B.
 Smith, Neil D.
 Smith, Paul J.
 Smith, Richard L.
 Smith, Thomas C.
 Smith, William E., Jr.
 Smith, William J.
 Smith, William S., Jr.
 Smithey, William J. H.
 Snell, William F.
 Snow, Kennedy B.
 Snyder, William R.
 Solomon, Selig
 Somers, David W., Jr.
 Somerville, Jack E.
 Sommer, Leroy G.
 Songster, John H.
 Southern, Wilson E.
 Spero, Joseph R.
 Spillars, Harold S.
 Spinks, Billy J.
 Spivey, Walter H.
 Splitt, Robert F.
 Spousta, Allen F.
 Spring, Arthur T.
 Springer, Emerson T.
 Spung, John R.
 Stacey, John L.
 Stampfli, Donald M.
 Stanford, Robert L.
 Stark, William R.
 Stebbins, John
 Steckel, John H.
 Steelback, Robert A.
 Stegall, Woodie C., Jr.
 Steinbrink, Earl E.
 Steiner, Frederick N.
 Stennett, William A.
 Stephens, John A.
 Sterling, Paul G.
 Stevenson, Leon McC., Jr.
 Stevenson, Frederick R.
 Stewart, Edward L., Jr.
 Stewart, George W.
 Stewart, Keith A.
 Stewart, Raymond E.
 Stiers, Lawrence K.
 Stiller, David J.
 Stoeckel, Anthony W.
 Stoetzer, Raymond N.
 Stogis, Peter D.
 Stokes, Bobby J.
 Stone, George P.
 Stong, Russell J.
 Stoodley, Francis H.
 Stoodt, William A.
 Stouffer, John W., II
 Stowell, Marshall A.
 Strahm, Kenneth A.
 Strange, Robert O., Jr.
 Strickland, Stanley P.
 Strommen, Gene A.
 Strong, Daniel L.
 Sturtevant, William J.
 Sullivan, Eugene T.
 Sullivan, Jeremiah F.
 Sutphen, Harold J.
 Swanson, Matthew C.
 Swartz, Theodore R.
 Sweat, Wesley A., Jr.
 Swift, Charles J., Jr.
 Sykes, Floyd E.
 Sylvester, Vincent
 Taft, Franklin L.
 Taggart, Donald J.
 Tambini, Anthony L., II
 Tannahill, Wayne J.
 Tarrico, George J.
 Tasker, William G.
 Tate, Johnnie D.
 Tate, Robert H., Jr.
 Tatro, Peter R.
 Taunt, Melvin E.
 Taylor, Gaylen D.
 Taylor, James E.
 Taylor, Jeremy D.
 Teague, Foster S.
 Tema, Robert P.
 Templeton, Wilbur D., Jr.
 Teter, Eugene V.
 Thall, Raymond L.
 Thaubald, Edward J.
 Theriault, Willard
 Thomas, Bruce A.
 Thomas, David M.
 Thomas, David D.
 Thomas, James W.
 Thomas, Jerold J.
 Thomas, John H., IV
 Thompson, Glynn M.
 Thompson, James K.
 Thompson, Theodore R.
 Thornsley, John T.
 Thorpe, Gordon L.
 Thorpe, Jack C.
 Thorpe, Paul J.
 Timlin, Joseph W., Jr.
 Timm, Dwight D.
 Tish, Samuel A.
 Titus, Edward D., Jr.
 Tollinger, John N., Jr.
 Tomion, Jack W.
 Tonnessen, Herbert G.
 Toole, Morton E.
 Touchton, John H., Jr.
 Trammell, Arthur B.
 Treiber, Maurice L.
 Trent, James A.
 Triemer, William L.
 Trost, Henry J., Jr.
 Troxel, Ralph E.
 Truxall, Charles W., Jr.
 Tully, Cecil R.
 Turner, John J., Jr.
 Turner, Robert R.
 Tuttle, Clinton L.
 Tyszkiewicz, Arthur K.
 Uebel, Paul F.
 Ulrich, John L.
 Underhill, Samuel G.
 Unger, Phillip E.
 Valana, James G.
 Van Landingham, Clyde H., Jr.
 Van Orden, Douglass L.
 Varnadore, James
 Varshock, George A.
 Vaughan, Edward B., Jr.
 Vaughn, Alton L.
 Vaughn, Charles G.
 Veek, Eugene B.
 Venezia, Howard
 Vermillion, John E.
 Vescellus, Milton J., Jr.
 Vezina, George R.
 Viessmann, Alex J.
 Vohr, James C., Jr.
 Vollmer, Thomas H.
 Vollmer, William E., Jr.
 Vosseller, Richard T.
 Waddell, Watson W.
 Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
 Wakatake, Clifford K.
 Walden, Warren L.
 Waldman, Jay R.
 Walker, Clarence L., Jr.
 Walker, Jimmy W.
 Walker, Richard A.
 Walker Thaddeus O., Jr.
 Wall, Arthur D., Jr.
 Wallace, Laird E.
 Walling, Samuel E.
 Walsh, John B.
 Walston, Jerry D.
 Walter, Clyde M.
 Ward, Richard R.
 Warden, Kenneth J.
 Waring, James D.
 Wartens, Robert L.
 Watson, John A.
 Wattay, Alexander E.
 Watts, Robert B.
 Webb, Kenneth H.
 Weber, Gerald M.
 Webert, Warren F.
 Weeks, James W.
 Welchman, Denis R.
 Welland, Robert F.
 Weller, Antone M.
 Wellborn, Robert M., Jr.
 Wells, Charles T.
 Werenskold, Gary W.
 Weseslesky, Allen E.
 Wesley, William J.

Wesolowski, Walter
West, William W.
Westfall, Van F.
Westlake, William R.
Weston, Jack L.
Whaley, Thomas P.
Whelan, Mathew J., Jr.
Whitaker, Walter H.
White, Ervin E.
White, George W., Jr.
White, John R.
White, Robert S.
Whiting, Donald W.
Whitling, Gregory L.
Whitmire, Wilson R.
Wible, William K.
Wichmann, Robert H.
Wicks, Lester H., Jr.
Wiebelhaus, Clarence J.
Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
Wilbur, Charles H.
Wild, Ronald A.
Wiley, Byron A.
Wilkey, Perry A.
Willey, Bruce T.
Williams, Carl E.
Willis, Clyde P.
Wilson, Bruce D.
Wilson, Garry L.
Wilson, Leonard O.
Wilson, Robert M.
Wilson, Russell W.
Wiltse, Ronald J.
Wincek, Walter J.
Winchester, Morton S.
Wing, Rodney C.
Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
Winn, Perry R., Jr.

To be lieutenants, line (LDO)

Clarence G. Bonham
Walter C. Kurz
Henry E. Loudermilk
Richard J. Halloran
Milton W. Schreck
Bernard F. Clausen
Thomas P. David
Herman L. Kinsel
Stephen B. Barnett
Jack D. Durham
Lee E. Barret, Jr.
Elmer E. Salo
John E. Campbell
Eugene A. Mount
John C. McIlwaine
Arthur L. Bentley
Homer R. Spann
LeRoy Bryant
William D. Hughes
George E. Davis
James E. Ballou
Howard E. Bylund
George H. Clayton, Jr.
Ralph W. Welch
Edward J. Kasnicki
Edward R. Mateer, Jr.
James O. Forgey
Robert G. O'Donnell
William J. Stephens
Paul F. Mademann
Allyn C. Christopher
Simon A. Roscoe, Jr.
Bruce F. Brown
James W. Brooks
James J. Murphy, Jr.
Theodore R. Weatherby
Jack L. Reifschneider
Llewellyn L. Naddy
Thomas W. Hefferon
Peter P. Vispo
James E. Brown
James L. Haning
Duane J. Counsell
John H. Richter
Raymond W. Ashbacher
James W. Warren

Wirth, Charles G.
Witt, Robert T., Jr.
Wolfe, Roderic L.
Womack, Leonard R.
Wood, Douglas R.
Wood, Melvin C.
Wood, Richard G.
Wood, Sidney E., Jr.
Woodrow, Warren A.
Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Francis G.
Woods, Theodore, K., Jr.
Woods, Walter, E.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolman, Joseph C.
Worrell, Dwight I.
Worst, Dale R.
Wright, Arthur S.
Wright, Joseph R.
Wuorenmäa, John P.
Wurth, John G.
Wyatt, Raymond E.
Wylie, Clayton R.
Wylie, Ronald P.
Wynn, Earl B., Jr.
Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yessak, Lawrence G.
Yetter, William S.
Yockey, Harry M.
Youmans, Virgil D., Jr.
Young, Edward B.
Zachman, John A.
Zackowski, Terrence L.
Zaludek, George M.
Zelna, Denis P.
Zimmer, Emory P.
Zollars, Allen M., Jr.
Zwick, John E.

Frederick W. Glaeser
Michael C. Staats
William J. O'Halloran
Clayton L. Sheppy
Elmer S. Clark
Howard L. Palmer
Robert D. Jebb
Oliver E. Harmon
Donald H. Millon
Norman C. Johnson
William J. Landroche, Jr.
Albert P. Festag
John R. Griffin
Thomas E. Condron
Lawrence C. Gore
Robert L. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. Goodman
Donald D. Shelton
Harold B. O'Connor
Robert J. Robertson
Robert P. Schmidt
Robert G. Patterson
Charles J. Whitbeck
Jay R. Collins
Richard S. Benoit
Gilbert A. O'Rear
Henry B. Perry
William Maliczowski
Ira B. Dement
Robert N. England
George R. Fromm
Ronald W. Richardson
John D. McKinnon
Myron S. Johnson
James J. Brown
Bernard C. Elliott
Charles L. Benjamin
Charles E. Farrar
Martin F. Zoolsek
Milfred C. Berg
James M. Donley

To be lieutenants, Medical Corps

Alfandre, Howard J.
Alford, Donald O.
Allshouse, Herbert E.
Altman, Robert L.
Ambur, Richard F.
Anderson, John R.
Anderson, Robert L.
Atkins, Claude C.
Atkinson, Schales L.
Atlas, Ernest
Atwell, Marshall E.
Bardana, Emil J., Jr.
Barr, Harry J.
Birdwell, Tom R.
Bolter, Delano W.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Borden, Robert S.
Brandt, Eugene M.
Brannon, William L., Jr.
Bredenberg, Willard A.
Brettschneider, Lawrence
Brown, John W.
Bush, Stephen T.
Byers, George E., Jr.
Byrd, Thomas R.
Caldwell, Marvin G.
Cannon, Richard E.
Cantow, Edward F.
Casimir, Anthony S.
Caspar, George H.
Castrow, Frederick F., Jr.
Chapman, David W.
Chapman, Robert E.
Christ, Ronald L.
Cilento, Bartley G.
Colburn, James E.
Compton, Harold L.
Cordray, Douglas R.
Cotten, Charles L.
Council, John C., Jr.
Crow, Judson L.
Cummins, Larry E.
Dangelo, Ernest P., Jr.
Davies, Raymond O., Jr.
Davis, David R., II
Davis, Gerald N.
Deignan, William E.
Dew, Benjamin G. W.
Donlan, Michael A.
Donovan, James F.
Drinkard, James P.
Dubner, Neil P.
Duff, Donald F.
Duhamel, Robert R.
Dunn, Julius E., Jr.
Erbs, Ronald C.
Farrell, Thomas A.
Farrell, William J.
Feeney, Robert A.
Finnerty, Edward J.
Fisher, Darrell E.
Fitzgerald, Robert B.
Fleming, Peter A.
Fogg, Charles D.
Fornes, Michael F.
Frensilii, Frederick J.
Gallagher, Hugh S.
Gard, Howard E.
Garden, John W.
Garvin, Edward J.
Gay, Michael L.
Gee, William
Geiger, Gerald F.
Gibbs, Benjamin F., Jr.
Gibson, John C.
Gilbert, Edward C.
Giovannini, Andrew M.
Gregonis, Joseph G.
Guiles, Paul A.
Hale, Charles H., III
Hall, John C.
Hand, David J.
Hanna, Charles A.
Hansen, Sigvard T., Jr.
Harlin, Robert S.
Harrington, Randall L.
Hibner, Dan W.
Hoertz, John H., Jr.
Hofmann, Richard M.
Holley, Hilmon D., Jr.

Hoye, John E.
Hudson, Royal C., Jr.
Jackson, Rudolph E.
Janicki, Robert S.
Jeffrey, Clyde G., Jr.
Jewusiak, Edward M.
Johnson, Ernest J.
Johnson, Walter T.
Johnson, William W.
Jones, Edward M.
Jones, George R.
Joyce, Robert W., Jr.
Katz, Harry I.
Kelfer, Frederic R.
Kellett, Cyril F., Jr.
Kelly, John C.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kennedy, Harry G., Jr.
Kessler, Carl P.
Knight, Jimmie H.
Kripps, Marvin M.
Langston, Randall A.
Latimer, Ronald G.
Leadbeater, John C.
Lee, Frederick M.
Leisring, John C.
Lentz, Ronald J.
MacAtee, Lawrence J.
Majors, Robert P., Jr.
Mangelson, Ned L.
Martin, William A.
Mauk, Sid "F," III
McDaniels, "L" "B"
McGeoy, Thomas J., Jr.
McGrail, John F.
McQueen, Samuel
McTammany, John R.
Meador, James C., Jr.
Melton, Russell W.
Meyer, Russell
Monihan, Richard M.
Moorefield, James M., Jr.
Moreland, Andrew
Morgan, James D.
Murnane, Thomas J.
Nedelman, Philip B.
Newburger, Alan C.
Nicholas, Carmine F.
Nichols, Robert D.
Nielsen, Surl L.
O'Donnell, Joseph E.
O'Hara, Patrick E.
Ohlund, Ronald K.
Olsen, James A.
Pasquale, Dominick N., Jr.
Patlovich, Joseph
Perlin, Elliott
PHELPS, Jerry A.
Phillip, Gordon W.
Pickering, Michael J.
Piscatelli, Robert L.
Playford, George A.
Pollard, Emil E.
Porter, Harry, Jr.

To be lieutenants, Supply Corps

Abele, Robert B.
Adams, Richard G.
Aldenderfer, William D.
Allen, Johnny L.
Allnutt, Alvin H.
Andersen, Thomas C.
Anglim, David L.
Avis, Bruce W.
Balding, David W.
Banas, John M.
Barstad, Clarence H.
Basse, Warner P.
Baxter, John W.
Beck, Kermit "E"
Berg, Robert K.
Bilodeau, James H.
Bittner, Burton F., Jr.
Borchardt, Heinz R.
Bradley, Donald A.
Briggs, John M.
Brown, Alan S.
Brown, Edward J., Jr.
Brown, Lee
Buffoni, Thomas J.
Buscher, Bernard A., Jr.
Carenza, John L.
Carter, Eugene T.
Chafey, William D.
Champion, Andrew A.
Chiple, Charles L., Jr.
Connolly, Robert I.
Coon, Paul D.
Corbitt, James R.
Crawford, James L.
Croeber, Hans R.
Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crouch, Robert L.
Culpepper, Glenn C.
Cunningham, John H.
Dawson, Gerald L.
Dennis, Ward J.
Deshaney, Donald J.

Dewey, Edward P.
 Dickinson, Thomas D.
 Divelbiss, Carl D.
 Dunn, Bernard D.
 Easley, Richard P.
 Eisenhower, David J.
 Farley, Charles V.
 Felton, Thomas O.
 Fields, Simeon
 Finbraaten, Laurence K.
 Foley, Donald P.
 Furiga, Richard D.
 Gilvary, Daniel J.
 Girman, Robert J.
 Girod, Albert P., Jr.
 Gleason, Bernard L.
 Godsey, Shirley T.
 Gore, Bobby J.
 Greene, Walter C., Jr.
 Gumpert, Leroy C.
 Haase, Robert L.
 Hahn, Gary E.
 Hale, Joe M.
 Hardin, Edward L.
 Harlow, Charles E.
 Heiberg, James E.
 Hinds, Douglas J.
 Hinkle, Otis R.
 Hollingsworth, Charles E.
 Horner, Norman K.
 Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
 Houghton, Donald W.
 Irons, John H.
 Iverson, Ronald I.
 Jackson, Ronald L.
 Jahn, Donald R.
 Johnson, Rodwell C.
 Jones, Jack L.
 Jones, Kenneth W.
 Jones, Leland B.
 Juncker, Carl F.
 Kachigian, George N.
 Kalafut, George W.
 Kriner, Lloyd B. W.
 Kulikowski, Jack A.
 Lane, Dean S.
 Lantsberger, Robert E.
 Lee, Gerald L.
 Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
 Loftus, Raymond P.
 Macafee, Douglas C.
 Magee, Gilbert L.
 Malzahn, Walter G.
 Marino, Leonard J.
 Martin, Michael J.
 Martineau, Paul J.
 McHugh, Thomas H.
 Melners, Arthur C., Jr.
 Milburn, Raymond F.
 Miller, Harold E.
 Miller, James E.
 Milliken, Gail L.
 Moore, Donald L.
 Moore, Richard C.
 Morse, William McF., Jr.
 Mouton, Earl F.

To be lieutenants, Supply Corps (LDO)

Jamie R. Murphy
 Diedrich K. Kriete-meyer
 Billy N. Jones
 Harold S. Hatcher
 Horal McR. Hughes
 George J. Cooney
 Charles A. Vedra
 Harold S. Parr
 James J. Hart, Jr.
 Robert H. O'Malley

To be lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Berg, Vernon E., Jr.
 Bertulio, Caesar J.
 Black, Gerald W.
 Brown, Robert G.
 Cook, Gordon S.
 Craven, Allen B.

Mummert, Dale R.
 Murphy, Ronald D.
 Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
 Nace, Richard H.
 Naughton, Thomas J.
 Nichols, Gerald M.
 Nolan, John E.
 Novak, Karl J.
 Nuss, Gary B.
 Nygaard, Richard B.
 O'Connell, Arthur B.
 Otto, Ronald E.
 Palumbo, Frederick C.
 Patterson, Jerry G.
 Petras, George A.
 Phillips, Robert A.
 Pierce, Leon L.
 Pinnell, Joseph K.
 Plante, Rene E.
 Platt, Stuart F.
 Pliska, Robert F.
 Pope, Jere P.
 Popik, Charles T.
 Quartana, Joseph P.
 Rankin, Ronald W.
 Reed, John D.
 Reilly, Joseph V., Jr.
 Rich, Philip J., Jr.
 Ridley, David E.
 Robinson, Robert L.
 Rook, Eugene C., Jr.
 Rubenstein, Ralph S.
 Schulte, Conrad P.
 Sechler, John L.
 Seidel, James L.
 Sellars, James B.
 Sheehan, John E., Jr.
 Shirley, Kenneth R.
 Shoemaker, Leroy E.
 Schroeder, John, Jr.
 Sims, Thomas M., Jr.
 Skelly, James F., Jr.
 Smith, Thomas J.
 Snow, Richard C.
 Sodrel, Donald L.
 Sofley, Billy R.
 Sommer, Melvin R.
 St. Martin, Robert W.
 Stoeffler, John A.
 Sutherland, Peter J.
 Taylor, William E.
 Templeton, James R.
 Terry, Victor W.
 Thompson, Robert L.
 Van Patten, Edward R.
 Visniski, Walte W., Jr.
 Wallace, Edwin R.
 Weinberg, Harry H.
 Weissinger, Thomas R.
 Weller, Thomas C., Jr.
 Whittaker, James B.
 Wilber, James R.
 Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
 Woodward, Corbin, Jr.
 Wright, Robert E.
 Youmans, Raymond W.
 Young, Jack L.

Kennard, William E.
 Linzey, Stanford E., Jr.
 Magor, Warren F.
 Miller, Harry R.
 Murray, George P.
 O'Brien, Eugene C.

To be lieutenants, Civil Engineer Corps

Allgaier, Donald D.
 Barczak, Jerome J.
 Barnes, John A.
 Bauer, John G.
 Bligh, James E.
 Boyce, Heyward E., III
 Carle, Barry
 Chabay, John L.
 Chin, William
 Christenson, Carl E.
 Clearwater, John L.
 Cook, Carlisle F., Jr.
 Cope, Ronald P.
 Corley, Wentworth H., Jr.
 Crisp, Hugh A.
 Delage, Paul M.
 Derr, Frederick M.
 Dugan, Robert W.
 Dunn, Jerome R.
 Earnst, Rossell A.
 Endebrock, Frank L., III
 Fegley, Charles E., III
 Fraser, John C., Jr.
 Frevert, Edward C., Jr.
 Gawarkiewicz, Joseph J., III
 Gibowicz, Charles J., Jr.
 Godsey, Jack L.
 Grady, Noel "A", Jr.
 Hartman, Paul K.

To be lieutenants, Dental Corps

Badger, Daniel G.
 Bloch, George A.
 Bourgeois, Aubrey J., Jr.
 Brazil, Robert W.
 Brown, Max W.
 Bumgardner, Willie A.
 Carlson, Roy F.
 Cassidy, Robert E.
 Ciardello, Carmen A., Jr.
 Cottle, Kenneth L.
 Dresen, William F.
 Dupcak, Joseph, Jr.
 Eckerson, Peter L.
 Giers, Paul E.
 Glazer, Sanford A.
 Hearon, Donald L.
 Hesby, Richard A.
 Hodes, Leonard F.
 Holcomb, John B.
 Holroyd, Samuel V.
 Jann, Robert C.
 Jansson, Albert W., Jr.
 Johnson, Bruce E.
 Kelly, James C., Jr.
 Kelly, William J., Jr.
 Klanderud, Douglas C.
 Krynski, Theodore T., Jr.

To be lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Aaron, Alvin "J"
 Baldauf, George W.
 Bertka, Robert E.
 Blankenship, William L.
 Bolton, Richard B.
 Bowden, Ronald R.
 Bowdren, Laurence P.
 Brideau, Donald J.
 Bryan, James O.
 Bryant, Eugene M., Jr.
 Casler, Wilfred I.
 Chastain, Howard T.
 Collier, Patrick J.
 Condon, Earl N.

Panko, Stephen M.
 Simmons, David E.
 Spencer, Carroll R.
 Struthers, Basil H.
 Thacker, Donald L.
 Vantassel, Lowell W.
 Young, Christopher B.

Jacob, Richard E.
 Johnson, Don P.
 Kelch, John A., Jr.
 Kenny, Robert E.
 Kimmons, Victor H.
 Kirkpatrick, James D.
 Klein, Dale M.
 Knauf, Richard H., Jr.
 Landes, William G.
 Ledder, William R.
 Lewis, Edmund F.
 Mansfield, Douglas J.
 McMenamin, Lester E., Jr.
 McNeill, James E.
 Merritt, Frederick D.
 Miller, Robert K.
 Mueller, Karl L.
 Murphy, Frank J.
 Perry, Edward S.
 Resnick, Rudolf
 Sandlin, Steven M.
 Saum, James H.
 Schattner, Bernard L.
 Seiber, Earl R., Jr.
 Shafer, Richard V.
 Siegle, Richard L.
 Somerset, Harold R.
 Tobin, James M.
 Totten, John C.
 Westcott, John A.
 Yoho, Hugh L.
 Young, Joseph F.

French, James A., Jr.
 Gobbel, Henry D.
 Gonsalves, John H.
 Goodson, James E.
 Gouldman, John R.
 Halverson, Charles W.
 Hatch, Emery J.
 Hatten, Ann C.
 Heaton, Harley L.
 Hoover, Donald E.
 Jenkins, Benny J.
 Joseph, Sammy W.
 Kane, George P.
 Kemp, James E.
 Kessler, Raymond B.
 Lanier, Bobby McD.
 Lawson, Donald R.
 Leadford, William M.
 Lecas, Kenneth E.
 Littner, Henry D.
 Lowe, Samuel C.
 Lowi, Bertram H.
 Martin, Douglas M.
 Mayo, Myron F.
 McAuliffe, Terrence J.
 McClung, Denzel H.
 McDermott, Roland W.
 McFee, Charles A.
 Millard, George W.
 Moore, Charles J.
 Mullinix, Chloe A.
 Nelson, Paul D.

To be lieutenants, Nurse Corps

Adams, Louise "J"
 Agnew, Lynnette A.
 Allen, Patricia M.
 Bell, Lou E.
 Burrell, Margaret M.
 Butler, Lois J.
 Carroll, Shirley F.
 Chisholm, Marie A.
 Chute, Judith R.
 Durian, Emma T.
 Emond, Lucille G.
 Fields, Mary A.
 Frazier, Frances M.
 Gedrys, Patricia C.
 Gillespie, Jacquelin C.
 Gomes, Alma M.
 Herrington, Daisy J.
 Higgins, Margaret J.
 Hines, Alyce M.
 Huggins, Mabel L.
 Jacobson, Dorothy M.
 Johnson, Mildred E.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Edwards
 Stephen H. Libien
 Eugene F. Luckstead

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald R. Gardner
 Kenneth J. Nordberg

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John K. Geppert
 Raymond Reid
 David P. Longenecker
 Clyde L. Sabala

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles S. Borden, Jr.
 Charles A. Brown
 Egil T. Steen, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent commander in the line of

the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211.

The following-named candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Harold L. Galloway	Royal S. Magnus
Rodney A. Bankson	James W. Hargus
James R. Kennish	Fred R. Copeland
Thomas A. Davis	Donald J. Degreaf
Melvin A. Wilson	John J. Schneider
Johnny F. Smith	Robert S. Stolz
James R. Reckner	Thomas J. Lopez
William H. Clark	Charles L. Volk, Jr.
David B. Dunlap	Larry G. Flesher
James J. Ostertag	Thomas P. Rankin
Donald A. Wilt	James E. Fausz
Kenneth J. Culverston	George C. Rains, Jr.
Russell F. Anderson	James E. Payton
Arthur D. Sharpilin	Henry T. Morris III
Harold E. Tittle	John P. Wilkinson III
Sherril W. Beam	William S. McGhee
Henry K. Wong	Frank Thelen III
Terry J. Tassin	Constance G. Bowman
Phillip R. Babb	Francis J. Harla, Jr.
David W. Vail	Rudolph J. Klampfer

The following-named candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman L. Schewe	George Dolores, Jr.
Robert J. Briggs	Preben E. Ebbesen
Kenneth H. Rasmussen	Kenneth R. Hall
Stanley A. Smith	Newell J. Paire, Jr.

Thomas R. Pine AT1, U.S. Navy to be a permanent ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY	
John B. Duran	
Anthony Bruno	
DECK	
Dean S. Higgins	
Joseph F. Heeney	
ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER	
Philip R. Stagg	
ADMINISTRATION	
Edward B. Brockman	
James F. Hornick	
Harry J. Nicholas	
ENGINEERING	
Robert H. Munger	
HULL	
Bernard H. Wilkens	
ELECTRONICS	
George L. Whyte	
Bruce T. Mundy	
George B. Faircloth, Jr.	
AVIATION OPERATIONS	
Richard W. Phillips	
PHOTOGRAPHY	
Vernon D. Emmerson	
AVIONICS	
Robert J. Thompson	
AVIATION MAINTENANCE	
Hance R. Bruce	

The following-named candidates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY
Robert O. Meitzner
Jack E. Edwards
James W. Sprouse

CIVIL ENGINEER

Paul G. Carder
Arnold T. German
Gerald S. Bernardo

DECK

Austin E. Smith	Regis H. Dunlap
John H. Kircheval, Jr.	Houston Childers
Charles A. Lewis	George G. Cornett
James J. Scroggins	Edmond B. Bennett
Donn E. Thomas	George H. Schuff
Paul A. Street	Richard D. Yentes
Thomas P. Hershey	

OPERATIONS

Nicholas D. Kuhn	Charles E. Evans, Jr.
John H. Boyd	John S. Rogers, Jr.

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

John D. Friedman
Glenn C. Wagner
Ernest W. Berry

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

Walter C. Wise, Jr.	Russell B. Merrick
Ralph G. Johnson	Ronald M. Wilder
Robert C. Stewart	

ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER

Cecil Battiste, Jr.
Robert R. Mastrich

ADMINISTRATION

George C. Warren	Joel L. Hudson
Dewey L. Alexander	Albert V. Schnoebelen
Thomas J. Farrell	George S. Young
Loy Herbert Wright	Willie M. Martinell
John J. Hull	

BANDMASTER

Donald H. Worthylake

ENGINEERING

Hal H. Hardwick, Jr.	Harry L. Kitterman
Frank W. Snyder	Rex E. Newman
George H. Dyer	James C. Pace
Latnay H. Miller	Ivan Belakjon
Douglas E. Bogue	Thomas DeLong
John G. Ries	

HULL

Bruce W. Taylor
Melvin F. Stone
Leon E. Byrd

ELECTRICIAN

Ralph H. Allen	Alfred C. Jemlich
Ted L. Palmer	Chester Flanagan

ELECTRONICS

James K. Sellers	Ralph N. Lies
Raymond G. Hulquist, Jr.	Frederic Vollbrecht
	Edward P. Tolbert

CRYPTOLOGY

Jack E. Fuller
Jim R. Watkins

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Richard F. Driscoll	Benjamin V. Bernardy
Joseph E. Miller	James G. Kearse
Tobias B. Latham, Jr.	

PHOTOGRAPHY

Joseph L. Marks

METEOROLOGY

Caloway H. West

AVIATION ORDNANCE

William Wagner, Jr.	Charles E. Martin
Charles B. Hanlon	Robert W. Lingo
Jack E. Blacksmith	Gene F. Monroe
Elmer J. Hoskins	Robert E. Geller
John T. Delaney	

AVIONICS

James V. Orlando, Jr.	John H. Meier
James D. Jordan	Richard C. Miller
George C. Wilson	John F. Uhr
Walter S. Dill	Robert W. Searles
Curtis W. Turner, Jr.	

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Ernest E. Weeks	Dominick E. Tineo
Leroy Grice	Robert W. Krueger
Alonzo R. Hamilton	Mathew G. Boyeson

William J. Chambers	Donald B. Stevens
James A. Downs	Robert B. Clark
James H. Mauney	Robert D. Kemple
Leslie F. Allen	Hines D. McNair
Ernest D. White	Orville A. Hemphill
Robert A. Ford, Jr.	Jack R. Perry
Frank H. Richardson	William G. Morgan
Billy J. Manly	Francis R. Schirra
Elmer G. Hieldbrant	Charles E. Woodward
Diggs O. Walton	Leonard Martin
Herbert M. Stanfield	Demetrios G. Gianakos
William D. Hardy	Charles J. Cook
Leonard R. Bailey	Walter D. Pass
James L. Maddox	William H. Wilson
William T. Hanson	James P. Doyle
William B. Nelson	Carl G. Patterson
John E. Jackson	Oscar H. Hazlip
Earle W. Hankey	William L. Maris, Jr.
Albert F. Whaley, Jr.	Joseph H. Gray, Jr.
Jefferson D. Stinson	Orland L. Kreitlow
Jack N. Blalock	Patrick E. O'Halloran, Jr.
James A. Jelley	Roy A. Gonzales
Richard J. Phillips	James E. Burns
James E. Taylor, Jr.	
James E. Livingston	
Raymond A. Eckert	

The following-named candidates to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY

William F. Norton	Daniel Pettigrew
Donald J. LaTorra	Daley D. Dougherty
Daniel S. Frank	Clifford C. Lord
Richard W. Newson	Kenneth V. McMillen
Jesse Collins, Jr.	Virgilio G. Gonzales
Robert L. Hall	Joseph F. Birmingham
Arthur B. Emde	Creighton E. Johnson
Edward T. Rucka	John P. Swing, Jr.
Robert L. Archibald	Mitchell Elich
Jack A. Bridgen	Herbert D. Bennett
John F. Black, Jr.	Frederick W. Schumann
Philip W. Gutman	Charles G. Waldrop
Allen W. Harris	James W. Fee
Donald J. Wilmes	William R. Andrea
Edward H. Lilley	Carl L. Humphrey
Joseph N. Pica	Richard C. Fisher
Terry M. Bartlett	Henry A. Vroman
Jerry W. Smith	Eugene J. Driscoll
James B. Craig	
Severiano L. Romero	

CIVIL ENGINEER

Eugene H. Steffens	Jimmie E. Jarvis
Huey W. Miller	William B. Grover
Harold D. Swinford	Terry C. Schrader
Eugene G. Jobe	Purcell C. Payne, Jr.
Joseph J. Malla	Alexander C. Gunn
Franklyn J. Hartman	Jerry W. King

DECK

Frederick D. Sears	Carl L. Seeler
Charles A. Mallett	Howard E. Sandusky
John L. Obrien	Earl A. Walters
James D. McCreary	John O. Wylie
Harold E. Huntsinger	Jerry L. Smith
Leonard D. James	Charles K. Hill
William H. Hewitt	Stanley K. Busteed
Jerry L. Scott	Jose M. Martinez, Jr.
Edmund J. Hunt	William L. Yeager

OPERATIONS

Robert W. Baker	Kenneth E. Bailey
Shirley A. Robbins	Paul E. VanDerveen
Kenneth W. Parker	William P. Miller
Bernard J. Domanski	William W. Miller
William H. Watkinson, Jr.	Edwin W. Creekmore, Jr.
William F. Bell	James L. Barrett
Eugene C. Franklin, Jr.	Benny M. Morgan
James M. Friesen	Jerry Beckham
Clarence J. Eckhoff, Jr.	Thomas M. Perkins
Glenn E. Murdock	Stephen H. Howell
Alfred M. Durazo	Clyde M. Perry
Jose E. Garza	Clarence E. Smith
William F. Smith	Keith D. Stoner
Ben L. Kegley	Robert J. Conniff
	Robin L. Brunson
	Steve Adams

Norman E. Drew
Willie E. Barton
Charles E. Hunnicutt

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

James E. Allen
James T. Harrelson
Wayne H. Mellendorf
Gilbert M. Morse

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

James D. Tow
Ambrose T. Donnelly
James R. Davis
Donald L. LaVelle
Robert E. Michael
Charles M. Guthrie
William G. Fell
Ronald C. Kimmel
Frank A. Butler

ORDNANCE, UNDERWATER

Roger T. Hyneman
John W. Polinsky
Thomas L. Atchison
William A. Roberts
James R. Bruce
Ronald G. Trahan
Ralph F. Ruhland

ADMINISTRATION

James V. Connor
Walter A. Bell
Richard B. Gilbert
Richard F. Clapper
Earley C. Gillie
Robert M. Cobb
Raymond Pfister
Glenn A. Thieme
James R. Becker
Carl A. Patin
Ronald B. Graham
Marlin A. Courtney
Edgar C. Kinard, Jr.
Hubert V. Harris
Ralph V. Powers
William T. Dotson
George G. Madsen
George Seebek
Ralph E. Chappell
John R. Peak
Roland G. Trance
Edward J. Cody
Carl R. Brown
Richard L. Randolph
Donald S. Flanagan
Joseph E. Baier
James R. Good
Richard L. McMeekin
Michael L. Martin
James L. Russell, Jr.
Clinton D. Older
Larry J. Scott
Paul W. Craker
Jerry Lane Fuller
Thomas N. Newbern
Keith D. Robinson
Wiley G. Dobbs
Donald R. Dean
Richard Perez
Proctor J. Gilbert, Jr.
Ronald B. Henderson

BANDMASTER

Compton C. Owens, Jr.
George F. Vipavetz
Ned E. Muffley

ENGINEERING

Paul V. Williams, Jr.
Robert I. McCullough
Chapin C. Brooks
Leon E. Strangeway
Harold R. Banks
Fernley R. Wagner, Jr.
John L. Barry
John F. Cameron
Eugene G. Fiske
George H. Smith
Thomas S. Sneed
Charles E. Wait III
James S. Frederick
Robert J. Hotalen

Ronald J. Arntz
Ralph T. Mott

Hulet G. Walls, Jr.
Joseph W. Saul
Paul V. Huebner
William W. Chambers

Morris E. Brooks
Carl S. Everett
Wallace R. Clearman
Ernest Lassich
James R. Carroll
Howard A. Albright
Robert C. Robbins
Eugene A. Stewart
Robert F. Peckham

Richard M. Jackman
Joseph N. Roman
Wendell R. Valentine
Gerland E. Hilleman
Donald A. Tamburello
Bobby W. Lowe
Gerald C. Evans

Robert T. Cyr
Jerome P. Burns, Jr.
Henry M. Thompson
Samuel M. Simmons
Bobby G. Windom
Robert L. Glass
Harvey E. Ludwig
Robert L. Greathouse
Jack E. Dameron
Robert E. Yates
Earl D. Junkins
Robert W. Mullican
Wayne K. Wilson
Tremaine K. Gearhart
Don L. Purtzer
Arthur L. Kirk
William R. Topping, Jr.
Charles E. Bousquet
Robert E. Ellis
Ralph W. Faxon
Robert D. Hicks
Robert F. Bruchman
William D. Farnham
John O. Ragsdale
George B. Thomas
Robert R. Hall
Bruce A. Lantz
David H. Smallman
Thomas E. Hedge II
Billy G. Coons
Joseph S. Memolo
Ray L. Widener
Clifford Brogan
John W. Hoggard, Jr.
Arthur B. Davis
Jerry L. Titus
Wood D. Waits
Richard C. Layman
Elmer W. Baller

Marion E. Carver
John E. Coyle
Dean W. Densmore
James F. Turner
Dix Richardson
Duane S. Warney
Steve A. Minnick, Jr.
Clifford V. Cook
Don M. Horne
Derrell Maroney
Robert J. Spooner
Ernest B. Migliorini
Carl T. Duncan
William E. Lloyd
Leonard S. Lyons
Clifford E. Pollock
Franky G. Watford
Robert L. Looney
George E. Eastberg
John R. Roberts
Daniel G. Whealton
Thomas F. Parker
Charles M. McCrea
Richard L. Bean
William E. Walker
Ellison J. Hearn
Charles D. Aubin
George H. Roberts
William Williams
William E. Breidert
Joseph T. Rucker
Robert W. Carlson
Robert S. Landis
Benjamin J. Gomes
James R. Lindley
Millard A. Cox, Jr.

Earl D. Shaw
Gary T. Hahn
George Laurick
Frederick S. Moore
Robert F. Foley
Roy E. Isaksen
John B. Lakin, Jr.
John D. McNab
Charles H. Johnson
Ralph J. Sage
Louie A. Schwartz

James N. Benson
Joe B. Goodson, Jr.
Eugene J. Bakkala
Paul E. Thorn
Jack H. Sweet
John L. McDonald, Jr.
Paul D. Tyson
Golden H. Johnson
Arthur A. Fried
Sheldon L. Loveless
James B. Cumble
George A. Stevenson
Frank W. Outcault
John F. Butterfield
William E. Watson
Walter L. Baird
Gerald G. Boyd
James L. Soderberg
Billie G. Kear
James E. Brashear, Jr.
Jay S. Webb
Edward E. West
Robert F. Smith
William A. Turner
Arthur R. Lassley
Charles R. Haire
Wilbert E. Dawson, Jr.
Calvin E. Keich

James R. Simmons
Douglas J. Johnson
Virgil E. Morrison
Arthur B. Cox
Pickens W. Irvine
Charles R. Trippel
Paul F. Kiser
Raymond F. Polk, Jr.
Harold S. Bush
Ronald G. Schwen-
dinger

Henry B. Cook
James E. Summers, Jr.
Eugene P. Krause
Robert A. Melody
Raymond L. Neesley
Jay E. Anthony
Fred L. Languell
Robert J. Jones
Robert A. Lewis
Harry R. Address
James M. McGrath
James P. Franks
Jose G. Escajeda, Jr.
Edward T. Lyon
John P. Heathscott
James P. Underwood
Alvin G. Cook, Jr.
Victor D. Segal
Martin L. Salter
James A. Vogt
Leroy J. Doran
John E. Hethcox
Kenneth D. Bryant
George E. Gifford
Earl C. Pike
Thomas J. Cooney
Peter C. Dirckx
Paul E. Tuttle
David F. Long
James C. Greene
Robert H. Obrien
Vander Clark, Jr.
Merton W. Arnold
Johnie R. Ashley, Jr.
Howard D. Harger

HULL

Walter W. Hess
Walter O. Nelson
Harold D. Smith
Jack L. Stevens
Lloyd J. McNabb
Joseph Dixon Mills
Kenneth F. Payton
Robert R. Williamson, Jr.
Forest D. Williamson

ELECTRICIAN

Roger W. Tucker
Gerald W. Kunz
James L. Rhodes
Jeremiah J. Murphy
Phillip D. Meek
James J. DeGange
Samuel W. Helm
Paul E. Pritchard
Lyle D. Vandenberg
Harry A. Brown
Paclano F. Bartolo
Joseph S. Stemmer, Jr.
John C. Malone
Charles K. Micele
Joseph Fox
Forest J. Cobb
John J. Joyce
Allan D. Campfield
Daniel E. Lambson
James M. Hollett
Norman S. Reaume
George M. Collins
Forney N. Richardson, Jr.
Edward S. Golle
Robert W. Holzapfel
Sidney T. Jones
James W. Dudgeon

ELECTRONICS

Donald A. McNett
John Butrovich III
Robert H. Yates
Donald L. Jackson
Darrell L. Valentine
William D. Ridley
Bobby P. Staton
Howard W. Dole
Gerald B. Swearingen
Marvin L. Duffy
William J. Edmison

Theodore W. Huckabone
Clayton N. Hilsabeck
Glenn W. Hinds
Franklyn E. Winterberg
William J. Byrd
Richard N. Hansen
Robert D. Poole
John J. McCool
Herman L. Skambraks

CRYPTOLOGY

Robert A. Maze
Hilbert R. Hubble
George E. Suthowski
Richard H. Schrader
Loyle B. Dozier
William H. Deemie
Richard E. Bornman
Kellogg P. Humphreys
Aaron J. Claassen
Bobby D. Kochenower
Robert J. Jensen
Robert J. Wagner

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Bobby R. Lanier
Robert L. Allison
James T. Ferguson
Thomas W. McMahon
Robert E. Morgan
Mark S. Short
David A. Radford
Richard W. Ritz
Maurice C. Tosspon
Eldon L. Armstrong
Leroy O. Storaasli

PHOTOGRAPHY

Larry E. Kramer
Ray L. Clark
Donald F. Williams
Edward E. Bonjorni

METEOROLOGY

Albert G. Dentrement
Richard D. Pritchard
Jack C. Hansen
Theodore J. Bourdon
James W. Stanfield
Roger W. Mason
Vernon R. Thompson
Robert J. Gray

AVIATION ORDINANCE

Guy Almond Smith, Jr.
Alva D. Watson, Jr.
Robert W. Bryant
William A. Hefty
Ronald J. Thurman
John F. Kautz
George G. Wright

AVIONICS

Robert C. Bucholz
Willis T. Wright
Richard A. Christian-son
Edwin H. Gless
John M. Jeffords
Lawrence S. Gray
Floyd M. Oakes
George W. Green
Norman L. Hansen II
Robert C. Roffey
Sherman M. Hunnell
Gilbert E. McGauley
Arthur Cornett
Geroge R. Jones
John P. Hall, Jr.
Robert W. Ballinger
Glenn J. Boston
Oval D. Brown
William V. Collins, Jr.
Francis L. King
James P. Dillon
Leonard Gordon
Roy B. Jackson
Ronald W. Morell
Jack T. Swann

Leslie M. Collins
Robert F. Boehme
Paul P. Villandre
Gerald P. Hansen
Milford E. Andersen
William J. Sharp
Donald H. Laudenschach
Fred Krejci
Joseph L. Byrns

Vander D. Hakes
Jac S. Weller
John W. McLaughlin
William H. Vernon
Sylvester Sneldar
Jack L. Eargle
Charles R. McIntyre
David R. Phaneuf
William D. Kahl
Robert W. Donald
Dale E. Fuller

Bert J. Anzini
Delbert P. Hoglund
Ambler B. M. Lopez
Arthur D. Billingsley
Norman E. Russ
Sumner C. Brown
Charles W. Baggett
George B. Hale, Jr.
Earl Armstrong, Jr.
Norman T. McCrimmon

STANLEY C. BAKER

Gary B. Gross
Harold Abbott
Larry N. Wilson

Karl M. Haacke
Daniel J. Lepore
Dale E. Grages
Harold E. Collins, Jr.
Raymond F. Martin-son
Paul O. Grisham

Allen L. McFearn, Jr.
Albert E. Robinson
Judson J. Hendricks
Jere F. Galloway
Robert K. Middlebrook
Kenneth L. Kelley
James W. Kincheloe

Edmund C. Cegler
Reginald C. Webb
Richard L. Taylor
Jimmie D. McKnight
William M. Greenwell
Stephen M. Bahr
Richard S. Brown
Glen T. Paulson
Francis L. Miller
Richard L. Jacobson
Franklin Drake
Richard L. Chambers
George U. Creamer
Leroy E. Buffin
George W. Bunch
Marion L. Beaudrot, Jr.
Rufus R. Sikes
Franklin O. Fox
Eugene Jordan
David L. Grossglass
Robert W. Cummings
Richard O. Erickson
Richard J. VanPelt
James E. Thorley
Henry B. Quinn, Jr.

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Lavern D. Listol
Phil Z. Stratton
James B. Janes
William J. Newton
James E. Graham
Robert H. Herrmann
Jack J. Kaufman
Frederick Dassler, Jr.
John E. Matthews
David F. Elliott
Robert W. McKean
Claude L. Overson
Delmar E. Patridge
Freddie J. Patten
Gene D. Ralston
Donald E. VanBelle
Roland H. Pritchett
Dale M. Burns
Laroyce Shaw
Melvin A. Koch
Eugene M. Savage
Charles E. Hudson
Edmund J. Shustack
William A. Longstreth
Glen L. Goddard
James A. Singletary
Mitchell O. Scobee
Clifford L. Cornell
Robert A. Gammons
Walter E. Carlyon III
Eugene E. Ernst
Donald L. Disharoon
Jeff G. Winthrop
Earl W. Gipp
Gaylon S. Hall
Bobby D. Crosson

Martin P. Young
Fred B. Irwin, Jr.
John L. Yeager
Claude D. Reynolds
Charles L. Templin
James R. Jones
Carl E. Snodgrass
Earl D. Shuford
S. J. Stone
Colin C. Pemberton
John T. Hall
Theodore R. Land
Robert W. Compton
Edwin R. Pryor III
George A. Felgar
Douglas F. Nicholson
Neil L. Wheeler
Baxter E. Biggs
Hartwell E. Nolan, Jr.
Anthony S. Adams
Gayle W. Bass
Frederick D. Cotton
Jack H. Gillespie
Barthol E. Talaasen
Robert V. Hull
Marvin A. Jensen
Dudley P. Keller
Henry C. Cole
Bobby J. Dickson
Roland F. Namtvedt
Lawrence L. Bedell
Charles E. Sisk
William C. Donahue
Idus L. Stockton

David H. Dalton, CTCA, U.S. Navy, to be an ensign in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named candidates selected as alternates to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, limited duty only, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ronald E. Ortenstone
James E. Mickelson
Jerry D. Crowe

OPERATIONS

Ronnie M. Campbell
Julian A. Galloway
Jack Bailey
Maxie H. Carter
Jerry D. Ward

John S. Townsend, Jr.
Gustavus A. Myers
Theodore McJunkin
James W. Lapp
Richard J. Fairhurst

ORDNANCE, CONTROL

Robert D. Dial
James L. Waters
Richard H. Pickering

ADMINISTRATION

Alan A. Smith
Erwin A. Sharp
Richard J. Adams
Roger D. Hughey
Tommy Shaw

Joseph C. Seckel
William D. Jones
Willis R. Kiker
Grover E. Wood

ENGINEERING

Antone Texeira, Jr.
Edward H. Remmers
Everett E. Sears
Grady L. Belt, Jr.
Floyd E. Rogers
Gene C. Harrison
Floyd A. Walker
James R. Howell

William D. D. McKenzie
Elwood Anders
Richard L. W. Smith
Eugene I. Trego
Gaylord W. Smelker
George P. Morrow
Bobby K. Redwine
Ralph H. Shaw

HULL

Robert Massey
Francis J. Lemieux

ELECTRICIAN

Norman C. Martin
Richard L. Bean
Charles Emmett Bowman
Joseph H. Schmidt

Wilson R. Estes, Jr.
George L. Williams
Robert J. Estep
James D. Zumwalt

ELECTRONICS

Leroy E. Jones
John E. Shaw
James A. Cullins

CRYPTOLOGY

Carl L. Moffett
Michael C. Osband

William N. Granville
Harry A. Brooks, Jr.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Eugene A. Havens

METEOROLOGY

Frederick K. Martin
Nathan L. Greenfeldt

AVIONICS

Frank J. Bowers
Richard D. Hartman
Clinton O. Roderick
Homer B. Graham, Jr.
Paul T. Chapman

Donald G. Robertshaw
James R. Trickett
Martin M. Boone
Eugene E. Lemay
Anton C. Magera, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1964:

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning James H. Aarestad, to be major, and ending Richard M. Wrona, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 29, 1964.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, July 20, 1964:

POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on June 16, 1964, of Mr. Raymond S. Manning to be postmaster at North Franklin, in the State of Connecticut.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Revision of the Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today, at the request of the Librarian of Congress, introduced a bill for revision of the copyright law.

The last general revision of the copyright laws occurred in 1909. Tremendous changes in technology have taken place in the intervening half century. These have fostered entire new industries and new methods for the reproduction and dissemination of literary and artistic works. The 1909 statute is no longer adequate for present-day conditions.

Past efforts to bring the copyright laws up to date have failed. In 1955 Congress provided funds for a comprehensive study by the Copyright Office as the groundwork for a general revision and in 1961, after much study, the Register issued a tentative report containing detailed recommendations. Widespread

discussions of the Register's report were undertaken.

A little over a year ago, the Copyright Office began presentation of sections of a draft bill to a panel of experts. The transcript of earlier meetings of the panel on the Register's report have been printed by our committee and we will also print the further discussions on the draft sections.

In the 87th Congress, the Judiciary Committee considered and approved House Joint Resolution 627, which provided for the temporary extension to December 31, 1964, of the renewal terms of all copyrights subsisting at the time the President signed the measure on September 19, 1962. The approval of this bill by the Congress indicated its interest in considering overall copyright legislation. I am therefore glad to find that the Register of Copyrights has submitted a bill at this time.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the purpose of introducing this legislation at this time is to provide an opportunity for examination by interested groups so that any suggestions or recommendations which they may wish to submit may be studied before the measure is taken up for consideration in the next session of Congress.

The auguries for substantial progress in copyright law reform are favorable. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for flexibility and compromise in this area. We have had a long period of preparation and it is time to proceed.

Award of Distinguished Service Medal to Hon. Carl Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citation which accompanied the Distinguished Service Medal that was awarded to the Honorable CARL VINSON, together with the speech delivered by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in connection with the award of the medal, during the ceremonies honoring the gentleman from